

A PLAIN
EXPLICATION
OF THE
First Eighteen **VERSES**
OF THE
First CHAPTER of the GOSPEL
Written by St. **JOHN**:

With short NOTES and OBSERVATIONS on the same.

To which is annex'd,
A SCRIPTURAL DEMONSTRATION
Of the *True Deity* of the *Eternal Word*,
Our Most Blessed LORD JESUS.

In Confirmation of what is briefly Observed and Inferred from the Four First VERSES in the fore-going Explication; wherein what was before printed to this Purpose in the Second Discourse, is more fully vindicated from such Exceptions as might be made against it. Occasion'd by the Reverend Dr. *Clarke* his Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

By WILLIAM LORIMER, *Minister of the Gospel.*

Miror quid sibi velint isti novorum Deorum fabri, dum Christum verum Deum confessi, mox eum excludunt à Patris Deitate; quasi possit esse verus Deus nisi qui unus est. Calvin. Instit. lib. 1. cap. 13. § 26.

L O N D O N:

Printed for *John Lawrence*, at the *Angel* in the
Poultry, 1713. Price 6 d.

A PLAIN
EXPLANATION
OF THE
First Eighteen VERSES
OF THE
First CHAPTER of the GOSPEL
Written by Mr. JOHN:

With Notes and Observations on the same.

To which is annexed
A SCHEMATICAL DEMONSTRATION
Of the True Body of the Eternal Word
Our Most Blessed Lord JESUS.

In Confirmation of what is briefly Observed and laid down
from the First EIGHTEEN VERSES in the foregoing Explan-
ation; wherein what was before printed to this Por-
tion is the Second Discourse, is more fully vindicated
from some Exceptions as might be made against it
Occasioned by the Reverend Dr. Clarke his Schism-
aticism of the same.

By WILLIAM LLOYD, Minister of the Gospel.

Now and for ever the same is published by the Author, John Lloyd
London, Printed by J. Smith, in the Strand, near St. Dunstons Church
in the Year 1708.



A PLAIN
 EXPLICATION
 OF THE
 First Eighteen VERSES
 OF THE
 FIRST CHAPTER of the GOSPEL
 Written by St. JOHN.

THE first Chapter of *John's* Gospel may be divided into three principal Parts, which may be called three Testimonies of the infinite Excellency and Dignity of our most blessed Lord *Jesus*. The First is of *John* the Apostle and Evangelist. The Second of *John* the Baptist. The Third is of several Disciples, who were called unto Christ, partly mediately by *John* the Baptist, and one of them by another; and partly immediately by Christ himself; which three Testimonies agree in this one thing, to wit, that *Jesus* of *Nazareth* is both the Christ of God, and Christ God-man, consisting of the Divine and Human Nature, most wonderfully united in one Person.

In the first Part, the Apostle and Evangelist *John* gives Testimony, 1. Unto the Deity of *Jesus* of *Nazareth*, and unto his Personality distinct from the Father, *Ver.* 1, 2. This he proves and illustrates, *Ver.* 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. 2. He gives express Testimony unto his Incarnation, unto his becoming Man, *Ver.* 14. And unto the End thereof, to wit, that as many as believe on him might be the Children of God, *Ver.* 11, 12, 13.

To which Testimony of his Incarnation, and that Men might be saved by Faith in him, is annexed a Declaration of his mediatory Glory and Excellency, and of the Blessings and Benefits that his People receive from him and by him, *Ver.* 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.

This is the Sum of the first Part of the Chapter, which contains the Testimony of *John* the Apostle and Evangelist; and some Part of *John* the Baptist's Testimony.

We return to the first Verse.

Ver. 1. *In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*

By the Word [*Beginning*] is here meant the Beginning of the Creation of the World, as clearly appears from the Context. In that Beginning it is said that the Word was, but it is not said, that he was made, as the *Arians* would have it; and therefore the Word was in the Beginning of Time, not as if he had not been before all Time: But having been from Eternity before all Time, he was also in the Beginning of Time, and gave first Being to Time, and all temporary things.

In the Beginning was the Word. By the Word is not meant an accidental Word, but a Substantial Personal Word, and that Word is the only begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ our Lord; whom the Evangelist and Apostle *John* calls here the Word, and elsewhere the Word of God, for several Reasons:

1. Because the accidental written Word treats of him principally, and refers most other things to him.
2. Because the Nature, Mind, and Will of God, is most clearly and fully revealed to us by Him, as the Father's Interpreter, Ver. 18. Christ is the living Oracle of the Father, the express Image of his Person, and the Brightness of his Glory.
3. Because, as great Men do their Works by a Word of Command, so God the Father doth his Works by his Son, as it were by his Majestick commanding Word, Eph. 3. 9. *God created all things by Jesus Christ*; that is, by him not barely considered as God, the same God that the Father is, but as the eternal Son and Word, which was with God the Father, and so was personally distinct from God the Father: By him so considered, God the Father created all things, as he also, from and with the Father, by one and the same absolute and divine and infinite Power created all things.
4. He is called the Word, to denote his eternal Generation and Emanation from the Father, which is wholly spiritual and ineffable, and is compared to the Generation of our Conception of things, which is called the Word of the Mind, and is modally distinct from the Mind, whence it proceeds, and where it resides. For some or all these Reasons, especially the 2d and 4th, it is thought that the Son of God is called the Word.

The Word was with God, i. e. the Son was with the Father, and as such distinct from him. And the Word was God, i. e. the Son was of the same Nature, Essence and Substance with the Father.



Father, and so they were both *one* God: Whence we may observe,

1. Against the *Socinians*, that Christ the Son of God had a pre-existent Being, before he was conceived by the holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin *Mary*; for he was *in the Beginning*.

2. Against the *Arians*; that he is not a meer Creature made before all other Creatures; for the Text saith not, that he was *made* in the Beginning, but that he *was* in the Beginning.

3. Christ hath given us the clearest and fullest Revelation of God's Nature, Mind and Will; for he is the *Word*.

4. The Eternal Generation of the Son of God is not to be conceived of as like unto any corporeal Generation; but is wholly spiritual, and the Manner of it incomprehensible, for he is the *Word* of God; and if the forming of Ideas and Images of things in our Minds be spiritual, and the Manner thereof hardly explicable, much more the eternal Generation of the Son of God, and the *Manner* of it, must be wholly spiritual and inexplicable.

5. That there is a real Distinction between the Son of God and God the Father, as such: For the *Word* was *with* God. The Son is one Person, and the Father is another; for the Son was *with* the Father. See this defended against the *Unitarians* Fiction, by Arch-bishop *Tillotson*, and Dr. *Williams's* Vindication; as also by Mr. *Boyle's* Vindication, &c.

6. That yet there is a real Identity between them; for the *Word* was *God*. The Son was of the same Nature and Essence, that the Father is of. So Father and Son as such are two Persons, yet but one and the same God, the same Supreme, independent, almighty, eternal God. See this asserted and proved by the very learned and reverend Bishop *Pearson* in his Exposition on the Creed, the 3th Edition, from Page 116 to 137, and from Page 142 to 144.

Ver. 2. *The same was in the Beginning with God.*

Here the same thing is repeated, to shew the Certainty of this Doctrine; that the Son and Father are two distinct Persons, and also to intimate unto us the Necessity of believing it in order to Salvation. Whence observe, 1. That it is a most certain Truth that God the Father and Son, who are one and the same God, are yet two distinct Persons, 1 *John* 1. 2. *John* 17. 31. 2. That this is a momentous important Truth; for the Christian Religion is grounded upon this Truth as its Foundation, without which it cannot subsist. Without this Distinction of the Persons of Father and Son there would not have been any such thing as the Incarnation of the Son and not of the Father, the Obedience and Death of the Son and not of the Father, the Satisfaction for our Sins made by the Son unto the Father. In a word, there would

would be no such thing as the Lamb's redeeming us to God by his Blood out of every Kindred and Tongue, and People, and Nation, *Rev. 5. 9.*

Ver. 3. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.

These Words further shew that Christ is truly God, and that he was in the Beginning of time, so as to be before all time; for all things, even Time it self, was made by him, and consequently he must be before all things, even before all Time, as the Cause before the Effect. And since without him there was nothing made that was made, it is evident against the *Arians*, that he was not himself made: For if he had been made, then something that was made had been made without him; to wit, he himself had been made without him; for it is impossible that any Person who is made can contribute any thing to the making of himself; otherwise he must be and not be at the same time, which implies a manifest Contradiction. We observe then, 1. That Christ the Son of God is the true God, because all things that were made were made by him, and nothing was made without him. Now he must needs be the true God who made all things, and without whom nothing was made. 2. That he is the eternal God; for he that made all things, even the Beginning of Time it self, must needs be before all things made, and before all Time, and must be himself unmade. Now he that is before all things made, and is himself unmade, must needs be from Eternity, and so the eternal God.

It is of no Weight what the *Socinians* say to evade the Force of this Argument, to wit, that the Meaning of this is only that in the Beginning of the Gospel and new Creation, Christ was with God, and that all things pertaining to the new Creation, were made by Christ, and no Part of it was made without him: For,

1. It is not said here [In the Beginning of the Gospel, or new Creation] but simply and absolutely, without any such Restriction or Limitation. *In the Beginning* was the Word; now where these Words [*In the Beginning*] are used absolutely, without any Restriction or Limitation, there they signify the first Creation only, *Gen. 1. 1. Heb. 1. 10.*

2. It is said absolutely and unlimitedly, that all things were made by him, and not all things pertaining to the new Creation.

3. The All things made by Christ comprehend that World which was made by him, and yet did not know him, *Ver. 10.* but that cannot be truly said of the new World, that it did not know him.

4. It is too jejune an Interpretation of the Apostle *John's* Words, to make him say, that in the Beginning of the Gospel of Christ, Christ was; for that was not questioned nor doubted of, whether

whether Christ was in being, when he first began to preach the Gospel in Human Nature ; for no Man in his Wits ever doubted of that : But it was questioned by *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, against whom *St. John* wrote, that *Jesus of Nazareth*, had any Being before he was conceived and born of *Mary* his Mother : Therefore, that *St. John* might reach his Adversaries, and confute them, it was necessary that he should say, that in the Beginning of the first Creation the *Word* was, and all things pertaining to the first Creation were made by him. And this he really did say, and that very pertinently, as the Case he had before him required ; whereas the *Socinians* would, by their new and false Gloss, make Saint *John* a very impertinent Writer, that went about to refute his Adversary, by saying only that which his Adversary and he were both agreed in, without adding thereunto wherein they disagreed. A rare way to refute an Adversary, to say just as he says !

Ver. 4. *In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men.*

By *Life* here is meant that energetical Virtue and Perfection of his Nature whereby he lives, and gives not only *Being*, but a *vital Being* to all that any way live ; and *Life* is in Christ both essentially and causally ; because he is essentially Life in himself ; and causally Life to all others that live either the Life of Nature, Grace or Glory. Christ is the living and life-giving Life ; and the Life that is in Christ is said to be the *Light of Men*. It is so causally and energetically ; it is that which gives the Light of Reason to all Mankind. It gives Men not only a vegetative and animal, but also a rational Life, whereby they are distinguished from Plants and brute Beasts.

It also gives Men all the spiritual saving Light of Grace, whereby good Men differ from bad Men. Whence we observe,

1. That as Christ is the true and eternal God, so he is the living God, that hath Life in himself, and gives all Life to the Creatures.

2. That he is the all-knowing and omniscient God ; for he is the Light of Men ; he gives Men all the Knowledge they have, of what kind soever ; and therefore he must needs have all Knowledge in himself. He is the God of Knowledge, 1 Sam. 2. 3. *He that teacheth Man Knowledge, shall not be know ?* Psal. 94. 10. *His Understanding is infinite,* Psal. 147. 5. *He is Light, and in him is no Darknes at all,* 1 John 1. 5.

Ver. 5. *And the Light shineth in Darknes, and the Darknes comprehendeth it not.*

By *Darknes* here is meant unregenerated Men, who are destitute of the Light of Faith, the spiritual Light of Grace. Such Men are so dark, so blind, with respect to spiritual and supernatural

natural things, that they are said to be Darknes it self in the Abstract. Hence the Light shineth on them, but they do not see it, because they are blinded with Ignorance, Prejudice and Lust. *The Light shineth in Darknes*, i. e. the Lord manifests himself to all those blinded Sinners, by the Light of his Works without them and within them; and to many of them by the Light of his Word; but they do not rightly discern that Light, nor the Lord in it, and by it. But the Fault is wholly in themselves, and not in the Lord, nor in the Light whereby he shines upon them, and manifests himself unto them; it is because they are Darknes, they are blind and ignorant, and love to be so: They shut their Eyes against the Light, and will not open them to behold it. Whence,

1. Observe, That God leaves not himself without Witness among any Nations, *Acts 14. 17.* for his Light shines upon the darkest of them all. By the Light of his Works he so manifests himself to the most barbarous Heathen Nations, that by the Help of that Light they might know more of his Being and Providence than they do.

2. Observe, That their gross Ignorance of God is inexcusable; for his Light shines on them, and shines also into their natural Conscience, *Rom. 2. 15.* And that they do not see, it is their own Fault; it is because they are Darknes. They have so darkened their own Minds, that they are as Darknes it self. Darknes is become so familiar and connatural to them, that they love it and delight in it, and hate the Light which shines on them and in them, and endeavour what they can to smother it, and put it out. So that their Impotence is not a meer Physical but a Moral Impotence; or if you will, it is Physico-Moral. It is so natural to them as to be also moral and voluntary; such as they approve of and delight in, and are unwilling to be cured of.

Ver. 6. *There was a Man sent from God, whose Name was John.*

Here the Apostle and Evangelist begins to confirm his own Testimony, by superadding to it the Testimony of *John Baptist*, concurring with his. And first he affirms that the Baptist was sent of God, i. e. he was sent immediately and extraordinarily, and his Divine Mission and Commission was sealed with the Seal of Heaven, to wit, antecedent and consequent Signs, and that excellent Spirit of shining Light and burning Zeal, wherewith he was endued. Secondly, He tells us that his Name was *John*, which signifies Grace or Gracious. Now the Testimony of such a Person who carried Grace in his Name, and by his Life and Actions shewed Grace to be in his Heart, is of great Weight, and being super-added to the Testimony of another gracious Man, is a strong Motive to induce us to believe.

Ver,

Ver. 7. *The same came for a Witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all Men through him might believe.*

In this Verse the Apostle and Evangelist first assigns the End of the Baptist's Mission, and tells us, it was that he might be for a Witness. *John Baptist* was sent, and came, that he might be for a Witness unto *Jesus of Nazareth*, that he is the true *Messias*, *God manifest in the Flesh*. Secondly, He assigns the End of his bearing Witness unto *Jesus*, and says it was, *That all Men through him might believe*, i. e. that all Men who knew him, and heard his Testimony, might have a sufficient Motive to induce them to believe, and so might be under an Obligation to believe in *Jesus of Nazareth*, as the true Christ. Whence we observe,

1. That the Lord doth not require us to believe that *Jesus* is the Christ, without any ground or reason for our so doing; but he first reveals himself to us by the Testimony of his Prophets and Apostles, and then requires us to believe upon their Testimony.

2. Observe, That the ground and reason of our believing in *Jesus* is firm and solid, and cannot deceive us, because the Prophets and Apostles were sent of, and appointed by God to give Testimony unto *Jesus*, so that their Testimony is God's own Testimony, which cannot but be a firm and solid Foundation of Faith.

3. Observe, That having such a Foundation for our Faith, we are bound to believe in *Jesus*, to believe in him as the true Christ, *God manifest in the Flesh*; and who as God is the Light of the natural World, and as God-man and Mediator is the Light of the spiritual World: *The Light that enlightens the Gentiles, and the Glory of his People Israel*, *Luke 2. 32*. And it is our great Fault, if we do not believe in him.

Ver. 8. *He was not that Light, but was sent to bear Witness of that Light.*

Here the Evangelist knowing, that some had been apt to have too high an esteem of *John Baptist*, and to mistake him for the *Messias*, the true Christ; he puts in a Caution, and asserts that *he was not that Light, but was sent to bear Witness of that Light*. Which is as if he had said, it is true, *John Baptist* was a very great and good Man, *He was a burning and shining Light*, *John 5. 35*. Yet *he was not that Light, but was sent to bear Witness of that Light*, i. e. he was not that increated, essential, original, infinite Light, which enlightens the whole Creation with all the Light they have of what kind soever; but he was a created, derived, finite Light, whose Office it was to bear witness of, and direct unto *Jesus* as the infinitely greater Light, and the Author of all created Light. Whence observe,

1. That we should have always a tender Regard to the Honour of Christ, and should be careful to prevent whatever may any way darken or obscure his Glory.

2. Observe, That it is Honour enough for the greatest of Men to be Christ's Servants, and to bear witness of him.

Mat. 11. 9, *John Baptist* was a very great Man and a great Light too, yet the Evangelist will not allow any to think,

that he was *that Light* which Christ Jesus is, but will have all to know that he was a much lesser Light than Christ Jesus is, that his Office and Honour was to be Christ's Servant and Witness, to be a subordinate lesser Light which directs Men to Christ, who only is that infinitely great Light, that enlightens the whole World.

Ver. 9. *That was the true Light, which lighteth every Man that cometh into the World.* Here,

1. *Jesus of Nazareth* is asserted to be that true Light; and that because all that Perfection and Excellency that is in any created Light, it is eminently in him, and it is from him, as the Effect from the Cause; and he is the Father and Fountain of all created Light. He is an infinite, immense, spiritual, intellectual Light, and the Author of all the Light that is in the World. And therefore,

2. It is asserted, That he lighteth every Man that cometh into the World. The plain meaning of which Words, is, that Christ either as he is God, or as he is God-man and Mediator, lighteth every Man in the World with what-ever Light he hath. Those Men who have only the Light of Reason, Christ as God lighteth them with that natural Light; and those Men who have also the spiritual and supernatural Light of Grace, it is Christ as God-man and Mediator, that lighteth them also with that spiritual and supernatural Light. Whence observe,

1. That whatever Good we have or do, whether it be natural, or supernatural, we ought to give Christ all the Glory of it, because he is the Author of it, *James* 1. 17.

2. Observe, That there is here no ground for that Doctrine of the *Quakers* and others, that Christ gives unto all Men without Exception, and that in all Ages, and in all Countreys of the World, I say, that he gives them all, supernatural Grace sufficient to Salvation: For this Scripture only says, *That Christ lighteth every Man that cometh into the World*; but doth not say, that he lighteth every Man in the World with supernatural Light. It is enough to verifie this Scripture, that he lighteth every Man with some Light natural or supernatural, and with all the Light he hath, whether it be natural or supernatural. And this Christ most certainly doth,

1. He

1. He lighteth every Man that cometh into the World with the natural Light of Reason: Even Infants and Fools are thus lighted by Christ as God, with the natural Light of Reason in Power and Principle, though not in Act and Exercise; because of the Indisposition of their bodily Organs.

2. And many, even all his peculiar People throughout the whole World, he lighteth also with the spiritual, supernatural, saving Light of Grace.

Ver. 10. *He was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not.*

Here are Three Things in this Verse.

1. It is affirmed, *That he was in the World*, i. e. not only by his essential Presence, as he is in all Creatures; but by Manifestation of his Power, Wisdom and Goodness in and through his Works.

2. It is affirmed, *That the World was made by him*, all created Persons and Things were made by him, as he is God.

3. It is denied, *That the World knew him*, i. e. the Men of the World, that are not enlightened with supernatural saving Grace, they knew him not. Such Men are called the World of the Ungodly, and they are fitly called the World.

(1.) Because of their vast Multitude.

(2.) Because of their worldly Affections. Whence observe,

1. That Christ as God is not only in the Church, but he is in the World also, and manifests himself some way to the World; he gives the World more Light than they make a good Use of.

2. That he made the World it self, and therefore is God.

3. That the World he made, is the old degenerate World; and cannot be here meant of the spiritual new World, to wit, the Christian Church: Because it is said, that the World which he made knew him not: But that is not true of the Church, but of the old, natural, degenerate, unrenewed World of Mankind.

4. We observe, That the Men of this World, Men of the worldly Spirit, whatever worldly Dignity they may be in, and whatever outward Advantages they enjoy above poor persecuted sincere Christians, yet they are in a very miserable Condition because they know not Christ, without the Knowledge of whom, nothing in the Earth can make them really Happy, but they are in a State of Sin and Death: And if they so continue, they are eternally undone. Whereas the poorest and meanest Person that rightly knows Christ, is translated from Death to Life, is in a State of Grace and Favour with God; and tho' he may be sadly afflicted for a Time, yet it is impossible, that he should be

John 5. 12. *miserable and undone for ever. For he that hath Christ hath Life: He hath the Life of Grace, and he hath an indefeasible unchangeable Right to the Life of Glory and Happiness for evermore, John 3. 36. Amen.*

II. The Apostle and Evangelist *John* gives Testimony unto the Eternal Word, and Son of God his Incarnation, and to the end thereof; to which Testimony is annexed a Declaration of his mediatory Glory, and Excellency, and of the Blessings and Benefits that his People receive from him and by him, from *Ver. 11.* to *Ver. 18.*

Ver. 11. He came unto his own, and his own received him not.

He came unto his own, i. e. In the human Nature, which he assumed into personal Union with the Divine, he came and preached the Gospel, declaring himself to be the true *Messias*, the Son of God and Saviour of Men; he came preaching and declaring this unto his own, that is, to the Nation of the *Jews*, who are said to be *his own*, because he not only made them as God (for in that respect all other Nations were as much his own as the *Jews* were) But,

1. Because they above all other People, were his visible Church in external Covenant with him, professing Faith in the true God, and expecting the coming of the *Messias*.

2. Because they were his own Country-men, as he was Man; he was more nearly related to them than to other Nations, as he and they were descended from the same common Stock, to wit, from *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*. And some also think that as he was the Son of *David*, and of the Royal Family, he was rightful Heir to the Crown, and King of the *Jews*: and so they were *de jure* his own Subjects. Certain it is, that they were his own in a peculiar Manner, in such a Sense, as the *Heathens* were not. But tho' they were thus *his own*, yet when he came to them, *they received him not*, i. e. the generality, the main Body of them received him not. They did not know and acknowledge him to be the true *Messias*, the Son of God, and Redeemer of Men; nor did they believe in him, love him and subject themselves to him as such. Whence we may observe,

(1.) That all the Members of the visible Church, and Professors of the true Religion, they are the Lord's, in such a Sense as those are not, who are without the Pale of the visible Church. They are the Lord's by outward Profession, they are his by Covenant Dedication, they are in external Covenant with him, and under Obligations to be his, which *Heathens* are not under.

(2.) Ob-

(2.) Observe, That as they are his own, so he comes to them; he comes to them in such a way as he doth not come to the *Heathens*, that never hear the Gospel. He comes and outwardly reveals the way of Salvation to them, and also offers himself and Salvation to them.

(3.) Observe, That yet the generality of them do not receive him, they do not receive him into their Hearts by Faith and Love. Christ is not known and believed on, even by many of those on whom his Light shines with much brightness in the Hemisphere of External, Objective, Evangelical Grace. And this will be such Men's Condemnation, that Light came unto them, but they loved Darkness so well, that they would not open their Eyes to receive the Light, *John 3. 19.* They do not perish because there was no Saviour, nor Salvation offered them; but because they neglect or refuse to receive Christ the only Saviour, and with him Salvation. Their not receiving Christ as he is revealed, and offered to them in the Gospel, is the immediate and meritorious Cause of their Heb. 2. 3. Damnation.

(4.) Observe, That if the most Part of Christ's own Countrymen did not believe the Word preached by him, who spake as never Man spake, and did not receive him by Faith and Love; Christ's faithful Ministers in these Days, should not think it strange, nor be discouraged, tho' many People to whom they come with the Gospel, do not receive them, nor believe the Word which they preach; for *Christ's own received him not.*

Ver. 12. But as many as received him, to them gave he Power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on his Name.

Tho' the generality did not receive Christ when he came unto them, yet some did receive; and it was not in vain that any received him, none ever lost his Labour that received Christ; but it was much to the Advantage of them that received him; for Christ put a great Honour upon them all. He gave them all, Power to become the Sons of God; the Original Word is *ἐξουσίαν*, and it signifies here, not Might, but Right or Privilege; to as many as received him, he gave the Right or Privilege to become the Sons of God: He advanced them to the Honour and Dignity of being the Sons of God; he adopted them all into the Family of God, and gave them Right to the Inheritance of his Children.

But who were they that received Christ, and by receiving him had the Honour to be the Sons of God? The Apostle and Evangelist tells us in the latter Part of the Verse, that they were those who *believed on his Name.* Who assented to the Word of God in Christ's Mouth; and with the Heart embraced Christ himself

himself as held forth in the Word; and gave themselves up to him, and trusted their Souls with him, to be by him saved from Sin and delivered from Wrath, and reconciled unto, and brought into Favour with God. They that so believed in Christ with intellectual Assent, affectionate Consent and fiducial Recumbency; they were the Persons that received Christ, that received him as Prophet, Priest, and King in all his Offices, and consequently they were the Persons whom he advanced to the Honour and Dignity of being the Sons of God. Whence observe,

1. That they are the right Receivers of Christ, not who receive him into their Hands or Houses only, but who receive him into their Hearts.

2. That it is by Faith that we receive Christ into our Hearts. Faith is a receiving Grace, it is of a receptive applicative Nature. As the Word of the Gospel offers Christ upon Terms unto all that hear the Gospel; so Faith receives Christ as he is offered, and applies him to every Believer in particular.

3. The Faith that receives Christ, it trusts him also and relies on him for Righteousness, Justification, Sanctification and Eternal Life; for it is a Faith whereby we believe on his Name.

4. They who receive Christ into their Hearts by Faith, and trust him as aforesaid, receive much Advantage by so doing. For Christ advances them all to the Honour and Dignity of being God's Children.

Ver. 13. *Which were born, not of Blood, nor of the Will of the Flesh, nor of the Will of Man, but of God.*

In this Verse the Evangelist shews, who they are that so believe in Christ, as to be thereby the Sons of God by Adoption? They are born or begotten to that Honour and Dignity, Filiation is founded in Generation. Natural Filiation is founded in natural Generation. But the Filiation here spoken of, is not Natural, but Spiritual and Divine, and therefore it cannot be founded in any natural Generation of what kind soever, but must be founded on a Generation that is like unto it self, to wit, Spiritual and Divine. And therefore the Evangelist says,

1. In the Negative, That Believers and God's adopted Children, are not born or begotten of any Thing that is meerly Natural.

2. He says in the Affirmative, That they are begotten or born of that which is Spiritual and Supernatural.

And first for the Negative, he says,

1. They are not born or begotten *ἐξ αἱμάτων*. Of Bloods, i. e. they are not begotten to this Spiritual Divine Sonship, by the mixture of their Parents Blood, by natural Generation. Tho' their Parents be through Grace the Children of God, yet as such they do not beget their Children, but they do it as the Children

of

of lapsed *Adam*; and therefore by natural Generation they do not convey supernatural Grace, but only human Nature, and natural Corruption.

2. They are not begotten or born to this spiritual Divine Sonship, *of the Will of the Flesh*, i. e. by the Power of *corrupt Nature as such*, or by the Power of the Man's own Will which is carnal, and enslaved to the sensitive Appetite, and swayed by carnal and sensual Passions, and Affections. Nor,

3. Are they begotten or born to it, *of the Will of Man*, i. e. by the Power of the Will, as it is *merely human and rational*. Tho' a Man be never so much refined by the Improvement of his own Reason, and perfected, and polished by Moral Philosophy, yet there is *no Power in Nature, even when it is moralized*, and improved to the utmost, whereby Man can be begotten and born to a spiritual Divine Sonship, without supernatural, special and effectual Grace. And therefore,

2. The Evangelist declares in the Affirmative, That Believers and God's adopted Sons, are born of God, i. e. they are begotten and born to that spiritual Divine Sonship, *by the Power of God's efficacious Grace*, which is wholly above the Power of Nature.

Whence we observe, 1. That Regeneration is *in order of Nature* before actual Faith, and so before the Justification of the Adult. For the first act of saving justifying Faith, is a *vital supernatural Act* of the Heart and Soul, and a vital supernatural Act of ours, *presupposes* in us a *vital supernatural Principle of Grace* from whence it proceeds. As in Nature the Child is first begotten, before it put forth an Act of natural Life, so in Grace the Child of God is first in order, begotten of God, and receives from the Lord of Life a supernatural Seed and Principle of Life, before it exert and put forth a supernatural Act of spiritual Life.

2. Observe, That hence appears the fallshood of the *Semi-Pelagians* Doctrine, that God's People do first of all believe, by making a good use of their natural Powers, and that thereby they obtain, and in the Language of the Ancients, *they merit the first supernatural subjective Grace*. That Doctrine is most certainly and evidently False. *For we are all the Children of God by Faith in Christ Jesus*, Gal. 3. 26. but we do not come to be the Children of God by any Power in Nature. But are begotten and born to that high Honour and Dignity, by God himself, that is, by the Power of his supernatural efficacious Grace.

3. Observe, That Two Things necessarily concur to the making us the Sons of God.

1. Regeneration.

2. Adoption.

Rege-

Regeneration gives us the new Divine Nature and Life, and so makes us in some measure like unto God our heavenly Father, and lays a Foundation for our being his Children by Adoption.

Then Adoption formally constitutes us, the Sons of God, and gives us the Rights and Privileges, the Honour and Dignity of his Children.

4. Observe, That this was a great End of the Eternal Word, his becoming Man and coming unto his own visibly in human Nature. The eternally begotten, and the only begotten Son of God, became the Son of Man, that we who by Nature and Practice are the Children of Wrath, might be begotten and born again, and made the Sons of God, and so might not perish, but have everlasting Life.

5. Observe, That for obtaining this great End of Christ's coming, we should most earnestly desire to the utmost of our Power, that God would take this great Work into his own Hands, that he would be pleased of his own good Will to regenerate us for Christ's sake, and cause us to believe in Christ, and then adopt us into the Number of his Children for Christ's sake. And for the effecting of this, we should constantly wait upon God, in the use of all the ordinary Means, which he hath appointed for this End; and should still call upon God to bless his own instituted Means, and to make them Effectual for the working of this great and saving Change on our Souls.

Ver. 14. *And the Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of Grace and Truth.*

In this Verse, the Evangelist doth expressly give Testimony to Christ's Incarnation; which he had done only implicirely before in ver. 11.

The Word was made Flesh. The Word, i. e. the same substantial personal Word, of which we spake before, was made Flesh, i. e. was made Man. For by *Flesh* here is meant nothing but the human Nature, which is called *Flesh* by a *Synecdoche*, the Part being put for the *Whole*, or the whole human Nature, even the Soul it self may possibly be called *Flesh*, when compared with the Divine Nature, and it may be so called to teach us, that not only the Body, but the Soul of Man is a very weak, frail, imperfect Thing in Comparison of the Divine Nature; and yet for all that, *The Word was made Flesh*, not indeed by essential Conversion of the Word into *Flesh*, but by the personal Union of the Word with *Flesh*. So that the Divine and Human Nature were so joined together as to make but one Person, which was done without

without any real change in the Divine Nature, but with a great change in the Human Nature for the better. Καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, and he dwelt among us, as in a Tabernacle. He dwelt in human Nature as in the Substance or Body of the legal Shadows, as in that which was signified and adumbrated by the Tabernacle under the Law; so that God who dwelt peculiarly then in the Tabernacle, now dwells in the human Nature as the *Shekinah* or Symbol of his peculiar, personal Presence.

And we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father. In these Words, begins the Declaration of his Mediatorial Glory and Excellency, and of the Blessings and Benefits we receive from and by him.

And from these Words, what I said appears probable, that Christ is said to have tabernacled in human Nature, because the Tabernacle was a Type of it, and God's dwelling in the Tabernacle under the Law, and manifesting his Presence by a bright shining Light from between the Cherubims, signified that God would dwell in the human Nature under the Gospel, and therein manifest himself to his People more clearly than ever he had done before. And accordingly he did, for the Evangelist here says, *we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of*, &c. We beheld his Glory by the Eye of Faith, and sometimes also we beheld his Glory by the Eye of Sense; we beheld it shining forth through the Walls of his Tabernacle, through the Vale of his Flesh, we beheld such a Glory in the Words which he spake, and in the Works which he did, as proved him to be indeed the only begotten Son of God. For the Particle *as* the (*as*) in this Place, doth not denote a meer Similitude, but a real Identity; and signifies, that the Glory of the *Word made Flesh*, which the Apostles and Primitive Christians saw shining through his earthly Tabernacle, was such a Glory as became the only begotten Son of God, and did demonstrate him to be really the only begotten Son of the Father. This beholding of his Glory being put in by way of Parenthesis, it follows in the end of the Verse, *That the Word made Flesh was full of Grace and Truth*, which joined with the Words before the Parenthesis, runs thus: *He dwelt among us full of Grace and Truth*. And,

First, It is said of Christ, as dwelling in human Nature, and conversing visibly with Men upon Earth, that he *was full of Grace*, and really he was full of Grace in several Respects.

(1.) In that, his human Nature was in a moral Estimation infinitely graced, dignified and honoured by its personal Union with the Divine Nature of the Eternal Word.

(2.) In that, his human Nature was adorned with the created Gifts of Grace far above all other Creatures; yea, in that the

Spirit of Grace dwelt in it, in a manner and measure incommunicable to any meer Creature, *John 1: 34.*

Secondly, It is said, *that he was full of Truth.* And that he was in several Respects;

(1.) He was full of Essential, Substantial, Original, Eternal Truth. For he was full of God; *in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, Col. 2: 9.* and God is Truth: The first Truth.

(2.) He was full of intellectual and ethical, moral Truth. His Thoughts, Apprehensions and Conceptions were exactly conform to the Things which he thought of, apprehended and conceived. And so his Thoughts, Apprehensions and Conceptions of Things, were all most perfectly true, and there was no falshood, nor error in them at all. Then for his Words, they were all exactly conform to his Thoughts, Apprehensions and Conceptions. *There was no Guile in his Mouth, 1 Pet. 2: 22.* And lastly, for his Actions, they were all exactly conform to his Words and Thoughts. As he thought and spake, so he did and ever will do. And consequently he was full of intellectual and ethical Truth.

(3.) He was full of Doctrinal Truth. He preached the Truth, the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth. There was a perfect Harmony in all his Doctrine, no one part of it, ever contradicted another. *He was the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, Rev. 1: 14. He was faithful to him that appointed him, Heb. 3: 2.* He did not conceal from his Disciples, any one Truth, that he had Commission to make known to them, *Psalms 40: 10. John 15: 15.*

(4.) He was full of Anti-typical Truth, i. e. he was the true Substance and Body of all the Shadows of the Law. The true Anti-type of all the Types. *Col. 2: 17. The Body is of Christ. And Rom. 15: 8.* It is said, *That Jesus Christ was a Minister of the Circumcision for the Truth of God, to confirm the Promises made unto the Fathers.* Thus we see that the Word made Flesh, and dwelling in the Tabernacle of Human Nature was full of Grace and Truth. From the whole Verse we may observe,

(1.) The wonderful Condescension of the Eternal Word, that tho' he was with God and was God, and made the whole World and all Creatures in it; tho' he was the true, eternal God, the living and all-knowing God, yet he condescended for our Sakes to become a weak, frail Man, even to be made Flesh,

(2.) Observe, That tho' he appeared in this World veiled with the Mantle of our Flesh, yet so much of his Glory shined forth through that Vail, as was sufficient to demonstrate him to be the Eternal and only begotten Son of God.

(3.) Ob-

(3.) Observe, That Christ's Human Nature is now the *Shekinah*, the Symbol of God's Presence. God is personally united to it, and present in it; and we are to make all our Addresses to God through the Person of Christ, and to offer up all our Spiritual Sacrifices to God through the Mediation of Christ, *John 14. 6. 1 Pet. 2. 5.*

(4.) Observe, That the very Human Nature of Christ is the most worthy and excellent of all Creatures, for it is full of Grace and Truth. It is fuller of Grace than any, than all other Creatures; and it is so full of Truth, that it is simply impossible that it should ever be guilty of the least Falseness, or Error.

(5.) Observe, That *Jesus of Nazareth* must needs be the true *Messias*, for so he declared himself to be; and his Testimony concerning himself must needs be true: Because he is full of Grace and Truth.

Ver. 15. John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, this was he, of whom I spake, He that cometh after me, is preferred before me, for he was before me.

In this Verse, *John* the Apostle and Evangelist, calls in the Testimony of *John* the Baptist, to confirm and strengthen his own Testimony which he had given to *Jesus of Nazareth*. And it is, as if he had said, It is not I alone who give him this Testimony, for *John* the Baptist also bare witness of him, and that with great Fervour and Zeal, for he cried saying, *This was he of whom I spake, he that cometh after me* (in respect of the Conception and Birth of his Human Nature) *is preferred before me* (is of far greater Worth and Excellency than I am); for he was before me (i. e. in respect of his Divine Nature and Person, he had an Existence in the beginning of this World, and before the beginning, even from Eternity). Whence we may

Observe, 1. That we are to use all the lawful Means we can to advance the Glory of Christ, as here *John* the Apostle and Evangelist, makes use of the Testimony of *John* the Baptist to set forth the Glory of Christ, and to commend him to the World; tho' his own Testimony alone, was sufficiently satisfactory to himself, and should have been sufficient to others also, yet he joins to it, the Testimony of *John* the Baptist, that by both, People might have superabundantly sufficient Satisfaction concerning *Jesus of Nazareth*.

Observe, 2. That we should be zealous for the Honour and Glory of Christ. So was *John* the Baptist, for he cried, i. e. he spake with great earnestness and fervour of Spirit, when he bare Witness of Christ.

Observe, 3. That certainly *Jesus Christ* had a being in respect of his Divine Nature and Person, before he was conceived and

born of the Virgin *Mary*. For tho' he came after *John Baptist*, in respect of his Conception and Birth, yet he was before him, his Divine Nature and Person was before, and on that account he was preferred before *John Baptist*.

Ver. 16. *And of his fulness have all we received, and Grace for Grace.*

Here he begins to declare what Blessings and Benefits we receive by Christ; and withal confirms the Truth of what he had said, that Christ is to be preferred before *John the Baptist*. By Christ's *fulness* here, we are in the General to understand his All-sufficiency, whereby he hath in himself, and gives forth from himself whatsoever is necessary to purchase Salvation for us, and to apply Salvation unto us, *Col. 1. 19. and 2. 9.* More particularly by Christ's *fulness* we are here to understand,

1. That *fulness* of Gifts and Graces, of Light and most excellent Vertues wherewith his human Nature was beautified and adorned; and shined most gloriously in the Eyes of God, of Angels and good Men.

2. That *fulness* of Efficacy and mediatorial Vertue, which he hath as God-Man, and whereby he is able to *save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him*, *Heb. 7. 25.*

Now out of this his *fulness*, it is said that all his People receive. Which gives us to understand, that we are empty and indigent, and cannot supply our own spiritual Wants; but we receive all our Supplies from Christ, who is the Fountain of Grace with respect to us, and we are empty Vessels that receive the Grace that he is pleased to put into them. We are the Objects on which his Grace terminates, and the Subjects on which it is poured out, and in which it is received. Further it is said, that the Thing we receive, is *Grace for Grace*. And that is,

1. In general, abundance of Grace, *χρεὺς ἀπὲρ χρεῖτος*, Grace upon Grace. Great plenty of Grace, more abundance of Grace now under the Gospel, than God's People formerly received, under the Law.

2. More particularly by *Grace for Grace*, may be meant,

(1.) Grace in the New Creation, for the Grace or instead of the Grace which we received in the Old first Creation, which we received and lost too in the first *Adam*; to wit, the Grace of Likeness to God, and Friendship and Communion with God. Or,

(2.) Grace actual and influential for Grace habitual, actual Grace to preserve, quicken, excite, and increase habitual Grace. Or,

(3.) *Grace for Grace*, i. e. we receive Grace and Favour with God, for the Grace and Favour that Christ hath with God; as also

also we receive Gifts of Grace into our Souls, answerable to the Gifts of Grace in Christ our Head : So that in some lower measure and proportion, we are made gracious like Christ. Christ is formed in us by our being conformed to him, and made like him in his imitable Perfections. Whence observe,

1. That we are of our selves, poor, empty, indigent Creatures, empty of all spiritual saving Good.

2. Observe, That there is fulness of Grace in Christ to supply our Wants, and to fill our emptiness.

3. That the Good we have, it is all received from Christ. And therefore we should be very humble, and humbly depend on Christ for the Continuance of what we have, and the increase of it, and for the Supply of what we want. 1 Cor. 4-7.

4. That Christ now under the Gospel, gives out Grace abundantly, to those who are disposed to receive it abundantly.

5. That those who are in Grace and Favour with God, are beholden to Christ for it, since it is on the Account of Christ's being in Grace and Favour with God the Father.

6. That those who receive of Christ's fulness, are made in some measure Gracious, as Christ is Gracious.

7. That the Lord's giving unto his People some saving Grace, is an earnest of more to be given. *For we receive Grace for Grace.*

Ver. 17. *For the Law was given by Moses, but Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ.*

By Law understand,

1. The Law of the Ten Commandments, the Moral Law, which is the rule of our Moral Actions.

2. The whole legal Pedagogy, or that very rigorous and burdensome Oeconomy of the Law, under which the Jewish Church was of old. So the Law is used in 2 Cor. 3. 7, 9.

3. The Ceremonial Law, which was a Shadow and Figure darkly Pointing unto Christ. The Law in all these Senses was given by Moses, as the visible Minister whom God used in that Business of giving the Law. *But Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ.*

(1.) *Grace came by him,* and that

(1.) The more plentiful and abundant measure of Grace, that is given under the Gospel.

(2.) The more clear and full Manifestation of God's Favour and Love to Mankind.

(3.) That gracious Power and Strength, whereby God's People are enabled sincerely to keep the Moral Law.

(4) The

(1.) The Gospel of Grace it self, as it sets forth Christ as already come. In all these Senses, *Grace came only by Jesus Christ.*

(2.) *Truth came by him*, i. e. not Truth simply considered as opposed to Falshood: But Promissory, Prophetical, Anti-typical Truth came by him, i. e. the verifying and fulfilling of the Promises, Prophecies, and Types, relating to the *Messias*, came by him. He is the very *Messias* promised of old; all the Prophecies describing the *Messias*, giving Marks and Characters to know him by, and prefixing the Time of his coming, agree to him, and are true of him and no other. He also is the substantial Truth, that was signified by all the Types, Figures and Shadows of the Law. And by him, God most clearly demonstrated his Truth and Faithfulness to the World, *Rom. 15. 8.* So that it is here fitly said, that as *Grace*, so *Truth came by Jesus Christ.* Whence observe,

(1.) That Christ Jesus is infinitely to be preferred before *Moses*, and the Gospel Dispensation before the Legal. For *Moses* had the Honour to be God's Servant, only in giving the Law and Legal Dispensation; but Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God, by whom he hath sent us Grace and Truth, Gospel Grace and Truth, Grace whereby the Moral Law is sincerely kept, and Truth whereby the Ceremonial Law is fulfilled; yea, such Grace and Truth as delivers us from the whole legal Oeconomy, considered as esteemed by the *Jews* a Covenant of Works to be justified or condemned by.

Observe, (2.) That no Man was ever, is, or ever will be justified and saved by the Works of the Law, but only by Faith in Christ. For Grace was always by Jesus Christ, *Acts 15. 11.*

Observe, (3.) We have the greatest Reason in the World to believe in Jesus Christ, *For Truth came by him.*

Observe, (4.) That God will never break his Word. He would not do it, to save his dearly beloved and only begotten Son from a poor despised Life, and an ignominious cursed Death, therefore he will not do it, on any other Account whatsoever.

Ver. 18. *No Man hath seen God at any Time; the only begotten Son, which is in the Bosom of the Father, he hath declared him,* i. e.

No mortal Man in this mortal Life, hath with bodily Eyes seen God; or hath with the Eyes of his Understanding seen God intuitively, as the Angels see him in Heaven, and as the Son saw him on Earth. *The only begotten Son, which is in the Bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.* Here Jesus is said to be the only begotten Son of God the Father, to intimate unto us, that he was so begotten of God, as none other ever was. That he

he only was from Eternity begotten after a most spiritual, secret and incomprehensible Manner.

(2.) Jesus is said to be in the Bosom of the Father. That is a metaphorical Form of Speech, and denotes the Son's intimate Union and Communion with the Father. It signifies,

(1.) That he is dearly beloved by the Father.

(2.) That he is intimately acquainted with the Father, that he hath a perfect Knowledge of him, of his Nature, Mind and Will, of his Heart and Affection, of his Purposes and Designs; and therefore is a fit Person to make him known to Men. And this he hath done; for it is written, *He hath* St. Mat. 11. 27.
St. Joh. 10. 11.
St. Joh. 16. 15.

declared him. Hence we learn,

(1.) That in this Mortal State, God cannot be seen with bodily Eyes.

(2.) That he cannot be seen intuitively, as the Son sees him.

(3.) That Christ is near and dear to God, and perfectly knows him.

(4.) That he hath given the fullest and clearest Revelation of God's Nature and Will, and according to that Revelation should we believe in God, and love him, and live to him.

Scriptural Demonstration

O F

The True Deity of the Eternal Word, and Son; shewing, That He is a Person, the Second in Order, and Distinct from the Father, and yet is not another God, either Co-ordinate with, or Subordinate to the Father, but one God with the Father, having the same Deity, only after a different Manner; with a clear Answer to some Objections: occasion'd by Dr. Clarke's Discourse of the Trinity.

SINCE I have observed, and briefly asserted and proved from the first Four Verses, of the First Chapter of the Gospel Written by St. John, That the *Eternal Word and Son* is the True Eternal God. It may possibly be demanded of me, whether He be God *Co-ordinate with*, or *Subordinate to* God the Father? To which I Answer, That the *Eternal Son*, is not another God, either *Co-ordinate with*, or *Subordinate to* the Father, but He is the *self same God*, that the Father is: He is God the Son, begotten of the Father from Eternity, after an incomprehensible manner, and hath the same Eternal Deity, which the Father hath, and yet He was in Glory *with* the Father from Eternity, and so was distinct from the Eternal Father, as the Eternal Son; I say *distinct*, a distinct Person, not in regard of a distinct Deity, but in regard of the *manner of having the self same Deity*. The Father hath the Deity *from no other Person*, the Son hath the Deity *from the Father*; but it is the *same Deity* in both; the difference is not in the Deity, but in *modo habendi eandem Deitatem*, in the manner of having the same Deity. And here let it be remembred, that the Deity *precisely and abstractly* considered, neither begets, nor is begotten, but it is the *distinct*

distinct Person of the Father, that begets the *distinct Person* of the Son after an incomprehensible manner; and in so doing, *communicates* his own individual Deity to the Son, and they remain Two distinct Persons, that have *Union and Communion* in the same Deity. I and my Father *are one*, (said the Son of God Himself, *John* 10. 30.) But what did the Lord mean by these Words? I answer, His Meaning manifestly appears from the Context: For He had said at the 28th Verse, that He gives unto His Sheep Eternal Life, and that they shall never Perish, neither shall any pluck them out of His Hand. Now our most Blessed Lord foreseeing that the *Jews* might demand a Proof of that Assertion, That *none shall pluck His Sheep out of His Hand*, He gave them a Proof of it, taken from the *Greatness and Power* of God the Father. The Father (said He at *v. 29.*) who gave them to me is greater than all, and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's Hand: Well, but granting that, (might the *Jews* say) what is that to the purpose, and how does it follow from thence, that none is able to pluck them out of your Hands? To that our Lord answers, and proves the Consequence, (*v. 30.*) by saying, ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἑσμέν, I and my Father (*ἑσμέν*) *we are*; there is a plurality of Persons, Two Persons, Father and Son, and yet they are both *One*, (*ἑσμέν ἐν*) *we are One*. But *wherein* are they *One*? I answer,

First, *Negatively*. They are not *One* in Person; the *personal Excellency* of the Father as *Father*, is not the same in the Son; no, they are distinguished by their personal Characters and Properties, and the Father hath the precedency in respect of his personal Excellency and Property *as such*, and so they are Two distinct Persons, Father and Son. I and the Father, (*ἑσμέν*) *we are*, in the plural Number, *we are Two*, and *not One Person*: The same Person is not, *cannot be* Father and Son; *in the same respect*, Father of Himself, and Son of Himself, that is impossible.

Secondly, I answer *Affirmatively*, that they are *One* in Greatness and Power, not in the Greatness and Power of the Father as *personal*, and proper to the Father as a distinct Person, but in the Greatness and Power of the Father as *He is God*; and so they are *One* in the Greatness and Power of the Deity, which is *common* to the Father and the Son: For all the Greatness and Power of the Father, is either,

(1st.) The Greatness and Power of his *Person as He is the Father*, and in that they are not *One*, as hath been proved. Or,

(2dly.) The Greatness and Power of *His Deity*, and therefore it must be in that Greatness and Power of the Deity that they are *One*; and if they are one in the Greatness and Power of the

Deity, then they *are one in the Deity it self*; for the Deity is not great and powerful by a Greatness and Power distinct from it self; no, that cannot be, the Deity does not borrow its Greatness and Power from another, but it is by it self, by its own essential Nature, great and powerful, infinitely great and powerful. The Deity of the Father is in its own essential Nature, one infinite Perfection, *formally or eminently* containing all possible *absolute Perfection*; and since the Eternal Son *is One* with the Father, in that Greatness and Power of the Father's Deity, which is not distinct from, but the same with the Deity; it follows by necessary Consequence, that the Son is one with the Father, by having the same Deity which the Father hath; and that the Father and Son are *one God*, by having *one and the same Deity*. And thus it manifestly appears, that our Saviour's Argument concludes with much evidence and certainty, that none shall ever pluck His Sheep out of His Hand, because He is one God with the Father, and hath one and the same *Absolute*, Divine Greatness and Power with the Father. For the *Jews* themselves would confess that none was able to pluck any out of the Father's Hand, and then from the Father and the Son's being *One*, as aforesaid, it follows by a most evident and necessary Consequence, that none can ever pluck any of Christ's Sheep out of His Hand. The *Jews* saw plainly the consequence and force of this Argument, if it be granted that the Father and the Son *are one in Greatness and Power*, for then they must be one God, and the Son must be *the same God* that the Father is. This therefore they denied as Blasphemy, and went about to stone our Blessed Lord as a Blasphemer: And when he ask'd them what they were a going to stone Him for? They answered, as we read in the 33^d Verse, That it was not for any good Work that He had done, but for Blasphemy; and because that *thou being a Man, makest thy self God*.

Now hence, I form this *Dilemma*, either the *Jews* did rightly understand the Words of our most Blessed Lord Jesus, That *He and the Father are one*; or they did not rightly understand them: One of these Two must be true, for they are Contradictories, and *there is no Medium* between them; there is no Place for a Third. Have a care then, and be upon thy Guard, if thou art a Christian, and not a *Jew* or blasphemous Deist; and beware that thou do not deny the Eternal Son's having the same Deity which the Father hath, and that they are one and the same God: For here's a *Dilemma* which will push thee, and be a sharp Thorn in thy Side which way so ever thou turn thy self. I demand then,

(1st.) Did the *Jews* rightly understand our Saviour's Words? If thou affirm that they did, then it follows necessarily, that the *Son is one God with the Father*, and they have one and the same Deity, for there can be but *one God*. And the fault of the *Jews* was this, that they accounted that to be Blasphemy, which is a great and important Truth; and from that great Truth, they ignorantly and falsely inferr'd, that He being a Man, *made Himself God*: Whereas, He did no such Thing, He did not make Himself God, but only *by necessary Consequence declared Himself to be God*, which he always really was; nor did his being Man hinder him from being God, for he was both: He was a Man in whom dwelt all the Fulness of the Godhead or Deity Bodily. But,

(2dly.) I demand, did the *Jews* not rightly understand our Saviour's Words, That *He and the Father are one*? If thou say'st that they did not rightly understand his Words, and that he did not mean that he and the Father *are one God*, and have one and the same Deity, then thou canst not deny but that they must have been under a great Mistake; they must have been in a dangerous Error, an Error of pernicious Consequence to themselves, and very injurious to him, by perverting his Words, and putting a blasphemous Sense on them; which he never meant, nor ever came into his Thoughts.

And if so, then as an honest and good Man, he was strictly obliged in Conscience to have immediately rectified their Mistake, and that by telling them plainly, without using any ambiguous Words which were capable of another Sense, that they quite mistook him, that he never had such a Thought as that he was God, the same God that the Father is; I say he ought to have told them as plainly as any Words can express a Thing, that he was not God, one God with the Father; that he abhorred any such Thought, and accounted it Blasphemy as much as they did. I say again, That *if he was not God, one and the same God with the Father*, but they misunderstood and perverted his Words to a Sense most highly dishonourable to God, and which he abhorred; he was in Conscience strictly obliged as an honest and good Man, to have declared *then and there most plainly, without all ambiguity*, that he was not God; that he was not the *one God*, the same God that the Father is; but that he was *infinitely distinct from, and inferiour to the Father's Deity*. And this he was bound in Conscience to have done for these Reasons.

First, For the Father's sake.

Secondly, For his own sake. And,

Thirdly, For the *Jews* sake.

First, He was bound in Conscience to have done it for the Father's sake. The *Jews* and he did both acknowledge that there is but one Living and True God; *Mark* 12. v. 29, 30, 32, 33, 34. And our most Blessed Lord owned that one Living and True God to be his Father; *John* 8. v. 54. *It is my Father that honoureth me, of whom ye say, that he is your God.* Now being accused by the unbelieving *Jews* of blasphemously robbing this one Living and True God of his Honour and Glory, and of assuming it unto himself, by affirming himself to be this one God; if this was a false Accusation, and he did not so much as pretend to be this one God, but that his Words were misunderstood, then he was bound in Conscience, for securing the Glory and Honour of God his Father, to have declared in the most expresse and plain Words which he could use, that he abhorred every such Thought; and to have told them most plainly that he meant no such Thing as they accused him of, and that he did not believe any such Thing of himself, as that he was God, the same one Living and True God: This he ought to have done for the Glory and Honour of God the Father; and this he would certainly have done, if he had not known and believed that he was God, the same Living and True God that the Father is. For being the most humble and holy Man that ever trod upon the Earth, and a Man who (above all others) sought not his own Will and Glory, but the Will and Glory of the Father that sent him, (*John* 5. v. 30. and 7. v. 18. chap. 8. v. 49, 50. and 17. v. 4.) and yet being charged with Blasphemy, in making himself God, and robbing God of the Glory due unto his Name; surely if he had not been God, and so had known the Charge to be false, he would have plainly denied the Charge with the greatest indignation and abhorrency, and would have desired his zealous Countreymen to conceive otherwise of his unconceivable Meanness, in comparison of the Infinite and Eternal God. For when *Peter* dissuaded him from going to *Jerusalem* to lay down his Life for his People, as his Father had given him Commandment; he most sharply rebuked him, with a *get thee behind me Satan, thou art an Offence unto me, for thou savourest not the Things that be of God, &c.* *Matth.* 16. 23. He could not endure to be in the least hindred from doing the Will of his Father. And upon another Occasion, it is said, *John* 2. 17. *That the Zeal of God's House had eaten him up.* Who then can think that a Man so Holy, Humble, and Self-denied, so very Zealous for the Honour of God's House, would have endured to be charged by the *Jews* of having blasphemously robbed God Himself (whom he owned to be his Father) of the Glory of his Eternal Deity, by making himself God, without expressing

ing his holy Indignation at such a horrid false Accusation, and that with the greatest imaginable Zeal for the incommunicable Glory of his Eternal Father. That is the first Reason, he was obliged in Conscience as an honest and good Man, to have done as aforesaid, for the Glory of God the Father.

Second Reason, He was obliged in Conscience to have done so, for the Vindication of himself and his own good Name and Reputation; for he could not but know and think, that if he did not with the greatest plainness endeavour to wipe off that blot, and clear himself from that foul Aspersions of Blasphemy, he would lose his Reputation amongst good People, and the Success of his Ministry would be much obstructed; therefore for his own Credit, and for the Success of his Labours and Endeavours to promote the publick Good, which he above all Men was most concerned for, he was bound in Conscience to have explained his Words with such a full Evidence as might give abundant Satisfaction to all reasonable Men, that the Accusation of Blasphemy charg'd upon him was utterly false; and that he owned himself to be infinitely distinguish'd from, and inferior to the Father's Eternal Deity.

Thir'd Reason, He was bound in Conscience to have done so, as aforesaid, for the sake of the *Jews*, his Countreymen and Zealous Accusers, for they had a little before, as it is written, *John 10. v. 24.* with a seeming seriousness and willingness to receive Instruction, desired him to make them no longer to doubt, or rather as it is rendred on the Margin, to hold them no longer in suspense, but to tell them plainly if he was the Christ; and then this occasion of Offence and Stumbling at him and his Doctrine coming in their way from his Words, *That he and his Father are one*, (whereupon they imagined that he had blasphemed the Eternal Father, and made himself God :) And this Offence so taken, being most likely above all other Things to hinder them from believing, he was bound in Conscience to have dealt plainly with them as they desired, and to have removed this Stumbling block out of their way of believing, by a most plain Explication of his own Words, the occasion of their Offence, and by a full and evident Declaration without ambiguity, that he was not the one Living and true God: This he should have done, and this he certainly would have done, as it became an honest, humble and good Man, and a great Lover of perishing Souls.

First, Because they had come unto him, with a desire to be plainly instructed by him.

Secondly, Because this was the way both to have secured his Human Nature from their Rage and Fury, and to have reconciled

ciled them to himself, and to have prepared their Minds to receive his Doctrine, and become his Disciples for the saving of their Souls; and without this, there was no hopes of gaining their good Opinion of his Person or Doctrine, whilst he lay under the foul Aspersions of the most horrid Blasphemy. For these Reasons he was bound in Conscience to have explained his Words, and declared his Sense as aforesaid, in the plainest manner that could have been express'd by Words; and he would certainly have done it, if he had been misunderstood, and had known himself not to be God.

And by this means, (1.) He would have given unto the one Living and True God, and his Father, the Glory due unto his Name.

(2.) He would have taken off the Rage of the Jews against himself, and prevented his being persecuted by them, out of a mistaken Zeal for God's Glory, which he sought the Exaltation of, incomparably more than they themselves did.

(3.) He would have done much towards the saving of their Souls, and the gaining of them to be his Disciples, by a plain rectifying of their Mistake (if they had been really mistaken) in that great and most important Point of Doctrine. But now did our most Holy and Humble, Wise and Prudent, True and Faithful Lord Jesus, on this occasion, declare plainly, and without ambiguity, that he is not God, one God with the Father? No, He did not, he was so far from doing it, that on the contrary, he defended the Truth of his Assertion, That he and the Father are one in Greatness and Power; and tho' he thereby endangered his Life, he defended what he had said in such a Form of Words, as plainly enough implied the same Thing for which he was accused of Blasphemy, and therefore when his Accusers had heard his Defence, they sought again to take him, *John 10. v. 39.* Well, but you may say, what was his Defence? I answer, That as it became his Infinite Wisdom in the state of Humiliation, in which he then was, he proceeded gradually, and began with an Argument, *a minore ad majus*, from the lesser to the greater, which was the lowest degree of his Defence, which he premised purposely to abate the Edge of their Rage and Fury, and to prepare them to hear and receive his main Defence: Thus then he reasoned. If Magistrates be called *Gods* in Holy Scripture, on the Account of their Commission and Office, and that without the least suspicion of Blasphemy, *John 10. v. 34, 35.* Then there can be far less ground to accuse me of Blasphemy, because I said I am the Son of God, and that because the Father hath Sanctified me and sent me into the World, *v. 36.* Say ye of him whom the Father hath Sanctified and sent into the World, thou blas-

blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God? Here our Lord doth not in the least deny what he had said, That he is one with the Father in Essential Divine Greatness and Power, but argues from the personal Distinction between him and the Father, and from the most high Office that he was set apart and design'd for before he came into the World in the Human Nature: So that here he affirms that he was the Son of God, and so personally distinct from the Father before he came into the World; and that the Father Sanctified him, that is, according to the Sense of the Word in the Hebrew Idiom, set him apart, and appointed him with His own voluntary consent to the high Office of Mediator between God and Men; and sent him also into the World with His consent to assume the Human Nature, and therein to exercise the Office of Mediator: All which is well consistent with his being the Eternal Son of God, of the same Divine Nature with his Eternal Father, and tho' this of being the Son of God in this highest Sense be not here express'd, yet it is not denyed, but it is here presupposed, as what he had said before, at v. 23, 29, 30. and is implied in his being appointed to so high an Office, as none was capable of, but one who is God as well as Man. As it is written, *Isa. 9. v. 6. Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the Government shall be upon his Shoulders, and his Name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, וְיִגְבֹּרֵל el gibbor, the mighty God. And Jer. 23. v. 5, 6. Behold, the Days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up unto David a Righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute Judgment and Justice in the Earth. In his Days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: And this is his Name whereby he shall be called, יְהוָה צְדִיקוֹ Jehovah Tsidkenu, the Lord our Righteousness.* Thus it appears that the first step he took in his own Defence, is well consistent with his being one and the same God with the Father, and yet distinct from him as his Eternally and only begotten Son.

But his main Defence lyes in the Argument from his miraculous Works, together with the End and Design of them, which we have at the 37 and 38th Verses, in these Words: *If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the Works; That ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him:* Here we see, he appealed to the miraculous Works which he wrought for the Confirmation of his Doctrine. He wrought such Miracles as could never have been done without the Power of God the Father; and therefore he called them the Works of his Father, because they were wrought by the Father's Power, and by his Power conjunctly: And that he wrought Miracles by the Power of God was notoriously known;

known; and consequently it was evident that God the Father seal'd and ratified his Doctrine, which he would never have done, if it had been False and Blasphemous, dishonourable to God and hurtful to the Souls of Men. God the Father, His sealing Christ's Doctrine by evident and certain Miracles, is sufficient to convince any rational Man, that it was infallibly true, and that Jesus Christ really is, what he affirmed himself to be, to wit, *The Son of God*, in such a transcendently high and excellent manner, as that he *and the Father are one*: They are *one in their absolute essential Nature*; they are *one in their absolute Divine Greatness and Power*: And to prove the Truth of this, and to convince People of it, was the very End and Design of those miraculous Works, and therefore he said at *v. 38*. Though ye believe not me, yet believe the Works which the Father and I do, *That ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in Him*. And here it is to be observed, that *the Father's being in the Son, and the Son in the Father*, is one and the same Thing in other Words, with *the Father and the Son's being one*; For this last, our Lord Jesus had said, at *ver. 30*. to wit, *That he and the Father are one*; ἐν ἑαυτῷ, where, by the Verb ἐαυτῷ, he held forth his Distinction from the Father, in respect of their *different manner of personal Subsistence*; but by the Noun (ἐν, *one*) which he affirmed of the Father and himself; he asserted their *Oneness in absolute Divine Greatness and Power*, and by necessary Consequence, that *he and the Father are one God*. The Jews understanding him thus, they had accused him of Blasphemy: In his own Vindication he denied their Consequence, and disproved their Accusation; but how did he do it? By denying that he had asserted himself to be one God with the Father: No such matter, but on the contrary, by asserting that he was the Son of God in such a supereminent way, that *the Father was in him, and he in the Father*; which in effect is the self same Thing with what he said before, and they had excepted against, to wit, *That he and the Father are one*. For the mutual Inbeing of the Father and Son, holds forth the *Oneness of their absolute Divine Nature*, and their being *Father and Son*; of whom that *mutual Inbeing* is affirmed, denotes their distinction from one another, in respect of their *different manner of personal Subsistence*; and so *his being in the Father and the Father in him*, is all one in effect with what he had said at the 30th Verse, (*I and the Father are one*) which he avows to be a Truth, and appeals to his miraculous Works which he did from and with the Father for the evident proof of it: (if I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not, but if I do, ——— believe the Works, *That ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in Him*.) But it may possibly

possibly be said, that however, he did not affirm in formal express Words that *he is God, one God with the Father*. I answer, that is true, and there was good reason why he should not so affirm it. Indeed, if he had been conscious to himself that he was not *God, one God with the Father*, he ought in Conscience to have denyed it with the greatest plainness, as hath been proved. But if he knew himself to be *God, one God with the Father*, as we also know and believe; then it is evident, That he was under no obligation to affirm in formal express Words, that he is *God, one God with the Father*; for it is not necessary that all Truths should be told to all Persons at all Times in the plainest formal express Words: And our most Blessed Lord had good Reason not to tell the Jews at that Time in the plainest formal express Words, that he was *God, one God with the Father*. For,

(1.) He knew very well that they were not then capable of receiving that great Truth; that they were not able to bear its being told them with the greatest plainness possible. He told his own Disciples upon another Occasion, that he had many Things to say unto them, but (said he) *Ye cannot bear them now*, John 16. 12. And if his own Disciples that were Believers, could not bear some Truths in the circumstances they were then in: He knew full well that the unbelieving Jews could then much less bear this great Truth, that he was *God, one God with the Father*, and that the telling it to them more plainly in formal express Words, would but have enraged them still more against him, that it would have been but the casting of a Pearl before Swine, who would have trampled it under their Feet, and turned again to rent him; (Matth. 7. 6.) Therefore in great Prudence he forbore to declare then to them in formal express Words, that he was *God, and one God with the Father*.

Secondly, There was another Reason with respect to himself, and the low State he was then in, his state of Humiliation and Suffering was not yet over; and during that low state to which he had voluntarily consented (with a most wonderful condescension) for the Glory of God and Men's Salvation, he did not affect to make himself known in all his glorious Dignity and Excellency, but to be in this World much like a great Prince incognito, till his great Work of Suffering was over, with a design to discover himself more fully, and to reveal himself more clearly by his Holy Spirit in his Apostles, after his Resurrection, Ascension, and glorious Exaltation in Heaven: This he promised to do; as it is written in John 16. 13, 14, 15. *How be it, when he, the Spirit is come, he will guide you in all Truth; — He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you, &c.* And he made his Promise good by his Spirit in his Apostles.

His Holy Spirit in and by the Apostles glorified him: For besides many other great and wonderful Things which he enabled the Apostles to do, he revealed to them by Inspiration, and by them he revealed to the Church by the Holy Scriptures, and that with the greatest plainness, that Jesus of Nazareth is God, one God with the Father. Witness blessed Paul, Col. 2. 9. *In him dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead bodily.* It is not θεότης, but θεότης, a Word which signifies the very Deity it self.

(2.) It is observable that τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος, the Fulness of the Deity dwells in the Son; whence we learn that he is perfectly and fully God: He is as much God as the Father is.

(3.) The Apostle (if it be possible) goeth one step higher, and saith that πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα, *all the Fulness of the Deity dwells in our Lord Jesus Christ*; thereby clearly intimating unto us, that Jesus the Son is *one God* with the Father: For there is not one Fulness of the Deity in the Father, and another Fulness of the Deity in the Son, but *all the Fulness of the Deity* is in the Son; and consequently the *same Fulness of the Deity* which is in the Father, is also in the Son, and the Son and the Father are in that respect one: They are the one True God. And so it is written by St. John, 1 John 5. 20. That the Son of God is the True God and Eternal Life. And that it is the Son, who is there said by St. John to be the True God, doth hence manifestly appear, that it is the same Person who is said to be the True God, and to be Eternal Life. But it is the Son that St. John affirms to be Eternal Life; as is evident from the First Chapter and Second Verse of the same Epistle, where he says, *We shew unto you that Eternal Life which was with the Father*, and was manifested unto us. Here the *Eternal Life* is most plainly distinguished from the Father, and therefore is not the Father but the Son, and consequently the Son who is the Eternal Life, is the True God also. For to be the True God and Eternal Life, is affirmed of one and the same Person.

Again, we learn from St. Paul, that the Son our Saviour Jesus Christ is the great God: Tit. 2. 13. *Looking for that blessed Hope, and the glorious Appearance of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.* I know very well that those who deny the Eternal Deity of Christ the Son of God, by the great God here, they understand the Father. But that is their mistake, for by the great God is meant God the Son, subsisting in personal Union with the Human Nature; And that for these Reasons.

(1.) Because if two Persons were meant here,
First, The Father, by the Words, *the great God.*

Secondly,

Secondly, The Son, by the Words, *our Saviour Jesus Christ*, then there would be Two Articles in the *Greek*, whereas there is but one Article before the Words, *the great God*, which are connected with the following Words, (*our Saviour Jesus Christ*) by a copulative Particle, without another Article, to teach us that the first and last Words, both signifie one and the same Person, and that our Saviour Jesus Christ is the great God, who will gloriously appear in human Nature to give us the blessed Reward, which we look and hope for. The Particle *καί* is not Disjunctive, but Conjunctive and Exegetical, and may well be rendred, *Even*, as thus [*Looking for the glorious appearance of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ*].

But (2.) My principal Reason on which I most of all rely, is this, That God the Father, the first Person never used to appear to any, as is generally confessed both by the Orthodox and *Arians*, nor is there any ground to believe, that ever he will appear. It is written indeed, that the Son Christ Jesus will appear to judge the World with Power and great Glory, and that *he shall come in the Glory of his Father*, St. Mat. 16. 27. But it is never said, that the Father himself will appear in his Glory: It is one thing for the Son to appear in the Glory of his Father, and quite another thing for the Father himself, *as he is the Father*, to appear gloriously. The first is true, the second is not so. Nor let any Man imagine, that it is too great an Honour for the Son to be called *the great God*, for the Adversaries themselves confess him to be *true God*, especially the *Arians* and our Modern *Arianizers*, and I have already proved, that the Son is the true God, and if he be the *true God*, then most certainly he is the great God also; for there are not two true Gods, whereof the one is *the great God*, and the other is *the little God*. It was therefore wisely and truly said, by Leo I. Bishop of Rome, Sermon. 2. *De Pentecoste, vera Deitas in nullo esse aut minor, aut major potest*, the true Deity can be in none either lesser or greater. And again, the same Author to the same Purpose, Sermon. 8. *in Nativit. Domini, gradus in verâ Divinitate esse non potest. Quoniam quicquid Deo minus est, Deus non est*. There can be no Degrees of lesser and greater in the true Deity. For whatsoever is less than God, is not God.

And that our Saviour Jesus Christ is the true God, the great God, yea, the Supream God, and consequently the same God with the Father, doth yet further appear from the Testimony of the Spirit of Truth by St. Paul, Rom. 9. 5. *Of whom, as concerning the Flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever, Amen. Socinus Resp. ad Wickum, p. 581, 2.* grants this to be understood of Christ, and not of God the Father, and that for

this Reason, because the simple Noun *εὐλογητός*, *Benedictus*, *bles-
sed*, when it signifies the same Thing with *benedictus sit*, *let be
blessed*, it is always almost put before that to which it is refer-
red, that is, it is put before that which is wished to be blessed.
But here *blessed* is not put *before*, but after *God*. Now tho'
in *English*, we may indifferently say, *God be blessed*, or *blessed
be God*, yet the Elegancy and Propriety of the *Greek* Language
will not allow it. That always in Doxologies, Wishes or
Prayers, puts *blessed* in the first Place before *God*. So it is in
all the Places of the New Testament, where the meaning is,
be blest, or *let him be so*. As in *Luke* 1. 68. *Ephes.* 1. 3. *2 Cor.*
1. 3. *1 Pet.* 1. 3. But tho' *Socinus* himself freely gives up this
Matter to us, yet our Modern *Unitarians* think to evade this
Text by telling us, that the last Words in the Text, are not a
Description of our blessed Saviour, but only a Doxology to God
the Father, and therefore should be render'd thus, of whom as
concerning the Flesh, Christ came; *God who is over all, be blef-
sed for evermore, Amen*. And I am truly sorry to find, that a
late celebrated *Arianizing Trinitarian* joins with them so far, as
to say expressly, *Page* 87, 88. of the *Scripture Doctrine of the
Trinity*, the *Greek* Words are of ambiguous Construction, and
may equally signify, either as the Modern *Socinians* would have
it, a *Doxology to the Father*, or as our Translation hath it, a De-
scription of Christ himself. And in favour of the *Unitarian* ren-
dring of the Words, he alledges the use of the Word *εὐλογητός*,
blessed, in seven Places of Scripture. But it is evident, that he
is mistaken in them all. For tho' in four of the Places cited,
there is indeed a Doxology; to wit, *Psalms* 89. 52. *2 Cor.* 1. 3.
Ephes. 1. 3. *1 Pet.* 1. 3. Yet in all the Four the Word *εὐλογητός*
is put before *κύριος* and *Θεός*, which is the usual way of Expre-
sion in all Doxologies; but in our Text, *Rom.* 9. 5. *Θεός* *God* is
put before *εὐλογητός* *blessed*, which is not the Form of Words
used in Doxologies; and plainly shews, that *Rom.* 9. 5. doth not
contain a formal Doxology, but an assertory Description of the
Deity of our blessed Saviour. And for the other Three Places,
they are all impertinently alledged to prove the pretended Doxo-
logical Sense of *Rom.* 9. 5.

For *First*, *Mark* 14. 61. There is nothing like a Doxology,
but only a Question put to our Saviour by the High Priest, *Art
thou the Christ, the Son of the blest?* To which our Saviour an-
swered affirmatively and said, *I am*. Whereby he acknowledged
God the Father to be the blessed God, but it doth by no Logick
follow, that therefore he himself is not the blessed God. For
both are true, the Father and the Son are both *one and the same
Blessed God*, tho' they are two Distinct Persons.

Second-

Secondly, The Second of the Three is so little to the Purpose, that I wonder such a Learned Man as the Reverend Author should have been so rash and inconsiderate, as to have mentioned, *Rom. 1. 25.* For,

(1.) There it is not wished, that God the Creator *may be blessed*, but it is positively asserted, *that he is blessed for ever*: *ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας*, who is blessed for ever.

(2.) The Apostle by the Spirit of God confirms the Assertion, by adding *Ἀμήν. Amen* to it. Which is not here only *Precatory* but *Assertory*, for it is well known, that *Amen* not only signifies *be it so*, but *it is so*; thus in *2 Cor. 1. 20.* all the Promises of God in him are *Yea*, and in him *Amen*. Where *Amen* is to be taken Assertively. *And the Promises of God in Christ are all, Amen*, that is, they are all true, they are all *so* as God hath said, and accordingly they will all certainly be made good and fulfilled.

Thirdly, As for *2 Cor. 11. 31.* *The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, *ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας*, which is *blessed for evermore*. All that can be made of this, is, that *to be blessed for evermore*, is ascribed unto the Father, which I grant with my whole Heart, and I add my own most hearty *Amen* to it. But what then, will it thence follow, that therefore the same Title cannot be ascribed also to the Son? I deny that Consequence, and I know it can never be proved. Or will it follow, that because the Apostle in *2 Cor. 11. 31.* affirms the Father to be *εὐλογητὸς*, *blessed for evermore*. Therefore in *Rom. 9. 5.* he did not affirm the same Thing of the Son, but only wished the Father to be blessed. I deny that Consequence also. And I affirm the quite contrary to be true, to wit, that if in *2 Cor. 11. 31.* The Apostle affirmed the Father to be *blessed for evermore*, that then in *Rom. 9. 5.* [he likewise affirmed Christ the Son to be *blessed for evermore*. For there is also the same Form of Words, *ὁ ὢν—εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας*; *Who is blessed for evermore*. And if these Words be Assertory and not Precatory, if they assert the Son Christ to be blest for evermore, then they assert him also to be *ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός*; *To be God over all*. For the Words are all so joined together, that the one Part of them cannot be Precatory and the other Assertory, but they all together contain a Description of the Deity of Christ, and assert him to be God over all, blessed for evermore; as the foregoing Words *τὸ καὶ σὰρκα* briefly denote and set forth his human Nature: So that the whole 5th Verse gives us an excellent Description of our Lord Christ both as Man and as God; as such an incomparable Man, as that he is God also, by a most wonderful Union of his Two Natures, Human and Divine, in one Divine Person, by Virtue of which Personal Union,

on, it is affirmed of the Man Christ Jesus in the Concrete, that *he is God over all, blessed for ever.*

Thus our Translation is cleared up, and freed from the objected ambiguity, and shewed to be exactly according to the Original; and the Reverend Doctor seems plainly to grant, that our Translation is right and good. For (saith he) our Translators pitched upon *the most natural and obvious rendering of the Words, and the Sense is not difficult.* But now if our Translation gives us the *most natural Sense* of the Words, then the other Sense is not *so natural*, but it must be comparatively *unnatural*. From whence it follows by a natural Consequence, that what he had said a little before is not true; it is not true, that the *Greek Words* are of so ambiguous Construction, that they may *equally* signifie either the Apostle's *wish and desire*, that not Christ, but *God who is over all*, may be blessed for evermore; or the Apostle's *Affirmation and Assertion*, that Christ who is Man as he came from the Fathers according to the Flesh, *is over all God blessed for evermore.* This last is the Sense which our Translators pitched upon, and this indeed is the *most natural Sense* of the Words, as they stand in the *Greek*. And consequently it is plainly impossible, that the same Words can *equally* signifie the other Doxological Sense, which is forced and unnatural; as the Reverend and Learned Mr. *Boyse* hath clearly proved in his Vindication of the true Deity of our blessed Saviour, *Page 24, 25.*

But suppose, the Words do really contain a Description of the true Deity of our Blessed Saviour, and it be granted by our Adversaries; yet will they not grant, that it can be proved from thence, that he is the Supream God, one and the same God with the Father, for, saith the Reverend Doctor, tho' Christ be here said *to be God over all*, yet the *Father is excepted*, as appears from *1 Cor. 15. 27.* For Answer to this,

First, I would know what the Doctor means by this, for his Words would seem to insinuate, as if some of those who believe Christ *to be God over all*, did hold also, that he is God over the Father, and that therefore it was necessary to put them in mind of the Apostles having excepted the Father from being *one of the all*, over which Christ is God. Now I do seriously profess, that I know none that are so Mad or so Wicked, as to hold that Christ is *God over the Father*, and I abhor the Blasphemy.

Secondly, I answer, That by the *All* over which Christ is God, we mean all created Nature, all Persons and Things which he himself hath created. But the Father *is not*, cannot possibly be *one* of those Persons or Things, which Christ as God hath created, therefore there was no Necessity for the Doctor here to
except

except the Father. Now if upon this, any should ask, why then did the Apostle make such an Exception, why did he say, *it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all Things under him.* To this Question, you may take the Answer of *Theodoret*, he advises us to remember and consider, that *St. Paul* was writing to the *Corinthians*, who lived amongst *Heathens*, and had lately been *Heathens* themselves, and had been addicted to the Fables of the *Greek Poets*, whereof one was, that their God *Jupiter*, had dethroned his Father *Saturn*; and *Heathenish Spirits* amongst them, might mock the Christians, and tell them that they ascribed such Power and Dominion to the Man *Christ Jesus*, whom they worshipped as the Son of God and as God, that they made another *Jupiter* of him, who turned his Father *Saturn* out of his Kingdom, and assumed the Supremacy and Dominion to himself. That this *Heathenish* Scoff, might make no Impression upon new Converts and weak Christians, the Apostle informed them, that there was no ground for it at all, because *Christ* was so far from usurping the Dominion which he had as Mediator, against his Father's Will, that on the contrary, he had freely given him that Dominion which he had as Mediator; and that tho' God the Father had given to the Son of Man *Christ Jesus*, Dominion over the whole Church, and over the whole World for the Good of the Church; yet it is manifest, that he had excepted himself, he had not given to the Mediator Dominion and Authority over himself, but only over all the World for the Glory of God and good of his Church, and as a Reward to himself for the great Service he had done in and by his human Nature; according to that in *Phil.* 2. 8, 9, 10, 11. The very Learned *Theodoret* thought, that such might be the occasion of *St. Paul's* making the foresaid Exception; and it is not improbable, that so it might be, but be that as it will. I answer,

Thirdly, That our Reverend Author did impertinently appeal to *1 Cor.* 15. 27. for clearing the Sense of *Rom.* 9. 5. because the Apostle in these Two Places, doth not speak *ad idem*, to the same thing: For in *1 Cor.* 15. he speaks of *Christ* as Man, and yet not as Man simply considered, but as such a Man, a Man that never had his Fellow in many Respects, a most incomparable, wonderful Man, a Man personally united to the Eternal Word, a Man in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily; a Man advanced by the Father with his own free Consent to the highest Office which any Man was capable of, and which he had not been capable of, if he had been a meer Man, and had not been God also. He speaks of him also, as having executed that high Office, as to the Suffering Part, and as being

being risen from the Dead, triumphantly ascended into Heaven; and most gloriously exalted at the Father's right Hand, invested with Authority and Dominion over the whole Church, and over the whole World for the Churches sake. This Glory and Dignity he was advanced unto after his Sufferings, this Power and Dominion over all, was given him according to ancient Agreement and Promise freely made; and so freely made, that it was possible in the Nature of the Thing, that it might never have been made; because it was possible he might never have had such an Office, he might never have been Mediator between God and Men. For God if he had pleased might have done by the whole Race of Mankind, as he did by the fallen Angels; he might have had Mercy on none of them, but left them all to perish without help or hope, and in such a possible Case there had been no Mediator, between God and Men, and so Christ had not been Mediator, he had never been advanced to such an high Office, he had never had such official Power and Authority: All this was of Free Grace, and depended absolutely on God's Free Will and Pleasure. And consequently it is evident, that the regal Power and Dominion, which St. Paul speaks of in 1 Cor. 15. was a delegated Power and Dominion; it was freely given to Christ for a Time, and as an excellent Means to a noble and glorious End: And that End being once fully obtained, it will certainly cease, it will be no more used as a Means for the obtaining of that End, when it is already fully obtained. But now I pray, what makes this for the clearing of the Sense of those Words, *Rom. 9. 5. Who is God over all, blessed for evermore?* Truly nothing at all. For in these Words the Apostle speaks of the Eternal Deity of our Saviour, as expressly distinguished from his Humanity, and in that Respect, he affirms Two Things,

(1.) *That he is God blessed for evermore.*

(2.) *That as such he is over all.*

First, He affirms, *That he is God blessed for evermore.* And consequently, that he is the same God, and hath the same Deity with the Father. For that Title of *blessed God*, or *God blessed for evermore*, is appropriated to the most high God. So *Luke 1. 58.* it is expressly given to the Lord God of Israel, who certainly is the most high God. So it was in the Question proposed by the High Priest to our Lord Jesus, *Mark 14. 61.* So it is in *Rom. 1. 25.* It's there given to the most High God and Creator, as contradistinguished from, and opposed to all Creatures and Inferiour Powers real or imaginary, which the World then worshipped. If Christ then had not been really the most High God, St. Paul writing to the Romans, would not have called him *God blessed for evermore*, since in the same Epistle writing against

against the Idolatry of the *Heathens*, he had condemned them for worshipping any besides the Creator, who is *God blessed for evermore*, that is, for worshipping any besides the most High God. For the Apostle would have thereby laid a stumbling Block in their way of believing the Christian Doctrine, and have given them occasion to retort upon him, that he himself worshiped a Man who is not the most High God, is not God blessed for evermore. But Holy *Paul* could easily have refuted this *Heathenish* Cavil, and did refute it, by telling them in the same Epistle, *chap. 9. 5.* That the Man Christ Jesus is also *God blessed for evermore*, that is, the most High God, and so a fit and proper Object of religious Divine Worship.

Finally, in *2 Cor. 11. 31.* the very same glorious Title is given to God the Father, as we heard before; and therefore the same being given to Christ the Son, it shows that he is the same God, and hath in him the same Deity with the Father.

Secondly, The Apostle affirms, that Christ *as God*, is *over all*, i. e. he hath a sovereign Authority and absolute Dominion over all the World, over the whole Creation. Now this *Dominion over all*, is quite another Thing than that Dominion *over all*, of which the Apostle writes in *1 Cor. 15.* for this Dominion *over all*, results necessarily from his Eternal Deity; and as the Deity is common to the Eternal Father and Son, so is this Dominion over all common to them both, it is the same in them both, as the Eternal Deity is the same in them both. For the Infinite Excellency and Perfection of the Deity, is the first Foundation of this Dominion, and gives a right to it, upon Supposition that a World be created; and no sooner can a World be created, but that Right is immediately in actual Exercise over the created World: And it is impossible, and implies a Contradiction, that there should be a God Creator, and a World created, and that God the Creator should not have an absolute Dominion over it, and be the actual Lord, Ruler and Governor of it. This therefore is justly called God's natural and essential Dominion, because it results naturally and essentially from the Nature and Essence of God, as God and Creator, and from the relation that is between him and the Creatures, as he is the Cause of them, and they are Effects of him, that necessarily depend and cannot but depend upon him, and are intirely in his Power, and at his Disposal every Moment of their Being and Existence. This is the Dominion *over all*, which *St. Paul* speaks of, *Rom. 9. 5.* and ascribes unto Christ not as Man, nor as Mediator, but *as God blessed for evermore*. And this Dominion *over all*, is inseparable from our Lord, and will never have an End, as that other mentioned, *1 Cor. 15.* will certainly have. More-

over, our Saviour Christ, being *God blessed for evermore*, so as to be Creator of the World also; this confirms what I have said concerning his Dominion over all the World, and its inseparableness from him. And that he is the Creator of the whole World, I have proved before from *John* 1. 3. and I shall now further prove it by other Parallel Texts of Scripture. Such as *Heb.* 1. 10, 11, 12. compared with *Psalms* 102. 24, 25, 26, 27. For what the Holy Psalmist said of the only true God, the God of *Israel*, (who certainly was, and is, the most High God,) that he *made*, and shall *destroy*, or *change* the World; the Apostle most clearly and expressly attributes it to the Son of God, saying, *Thou* (to wit, the Son, to whom the Father saith a little before, *Thy Throne O God is for ever and ever*, &c.) *Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thine Hands, they shall perish, but thou remainest*, &c. This proves Christ both to be *God, blessed for evermore*, and also to be *God over all*, to have a natural necessary Dominion over the whole World, and so to be the most High God. For throughout the whole Old Testament the true God, the God of *Israel*, distinguisheth himself from all other pretended Deities by this, that he only was the Maker of Heaven and Earth; he challenges this as his peculiar Glory. *Neh.* 9. 6. *Thou, even thou art Lord alone, thou hast made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens with all their Host, the Earth and all Things that are therein, the Seas and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all, and the Host of Heaven worshippeth thee.* See also to this purpose, *2 Kings* 19. 15. *Isa.* 45. 12. But as for those Gods that have not created the Heavens and the Earth, the God of *Israel* declares, that they shall perish from the Earth, and from under these Heavens; *Jer.* 10. 11. but as it follows in the very next Verse 12. *He* (that is, the Lord, the true God, the living God, the everlasting King, mentioned *ver.* 10.) *He hath made the Earth by his Power, he hath established the World by his Wisdom, and hath stretched out the Heavens by his Discretion.* Now this our Lord Christ, the Eternal Son of God did, he in the beginning laid the Foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens were the Works of his Hands, &c. Witness the express Words of the Apostle, cited out of the 102 *Psalms*. Therefore he is the Lord, the true God, the living God, the everlasting King, and therefore he and the Father are one, they are one God, and have one and the same Deity, tho' they were and are, and ever will be Two Distinct Persons, Father and Son.

Another proof of this important Truth, we have in *Col.* 1. 16. *For by him were all Things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers: All Things were created by him*

him and for him. And he is before all Things, &c. The Person thus described as *Creator* of the World, is certainly the Son of God mentioned before, and he is set forth to us as the Creator not only of all material Beings, but also of all Finite Spirits, even the highest of them all. Now this cannot be understood of the new Creation, but must of necessity be taken as clearly expressive of the old and first Creation.

(1.) Because all the Men upon Earth never were, nor ever will be made new Creatures; there always have been, and still are absurd unreasonable Men, that have not Faith; 2 *Thef.* 3. 2.

(2.) Invisible Spirits, good and evil Angels never were, nor ever will be made new Creatures. But all Things in Heaven and Earth, visible and invisible, Angels and Men, were created by the Son of God. Therefore it is the old and first Creation, and not the new moral spiritual Creation, whereof the Apostle affirms him to be the Cause. All this is granted by our *Arian* and *Arianizing* Divines; but they think to elude and evade the force of the Argument, by saying that the Son was only the ministerial instrumental Cause, whereby the Father himself created all Things. But this is not, this cannot be true, that the Son was only the Instrument whereby the Father created the World. For,

(1.) The Son created the very first Matter, out of which the visible World was formed. For that the very first Matter was not Eternal and uncreated, is evident both from *Prov.* 8. 26. while as yet he had not made the Earth, nor the Fields, nor the highest or chief part of the Dust of the World: That is, *materia prima*, the first Matter. In the Original Hebrew it is, עֲפָרוֹת תְּבֵל, *Rosh Haphroth Tebel*, which may well be rendred *primordiales pulveres orbis*, the primordial or first Dusts of the World. And also it is evident from this, *Col.* 1. 16. where it is expressly said, That all Things pertaining to Heaven and Earth were created, whether they be visible or invisible. Now the first Matter of Heaven and Earth must necessarily fall under one of the Members of that disjunction, visible or invisible, for they are *contradictorie opposita inter quæ nullum datur, nec dari potest medium*. They are opposite to one another by a contradictory Opposition, between which there can be no medium, but every Thing belonging to Heaven and Earth must be the one or the other, must be visible or invisible. And whether you say the first Matter of the Heavens and Earth was visible or invisible, is all one here, for which soever of them it be, it must have been created, for all both visible and invisible were created: And then surely the first created Matter, could not be created of a former created Matter, for that implies a manifest Contradiction; to wit, that it was the first and not the first, because there would be one be-

fore it: Besides, that the same question and difficulty would be urged against us concerning the former created Matter, and so we should be driven on *in infinitum*, or we must stop at last, and why not *as well at first*, in some first Matter which by Infinite Power was created of nothing, *i. e.* without any former pre-existent Matter. Now, since the Son created the first Matter of the material World, and all the finite Spirits of the intellectual spiritual World, of nothing, *i. e.* without any Thing to make them of; I cannot possibly see how he could be the instrumental Cause of creating the World, For there was *no use of, no Place for an instrumental Cause* to operate, *no Thing* to fix an Instrument upon: Besides, that an instrumental Cause is of a bounded and limited Power, whereas no Cause could create the World of nothing, but such as was of an immense, boundless, unlimited, infinite Power; and therefore the Son who created the World as *afore said*, could not be the instrumental, but must have been with the Eternal Father, the principal Cause of the World's Creation.

(2.) It is not True, that *the Son* was only the instrumental Cause of creating the World, because the Spirit of Truth saith expressly, that *all Things* were created, $\delta\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, *by him and for him*: By him as the *efficient Cause*, and for him as the *final Cause*. This gives us to understand that the Son as *one God* with the Father, is the ultimate end of the Creation, and consequently that he is the first principal Cause of it. For tho' Things may be said to be made both *by* the principal and instrumental Cause, yet they are not said to be made *for* the instrumental Cause, but *for the first and principal Cause*. But all Things were created not *only* by the Son, but likewise *for the Son*; and therefore the Son created all Things, as the first and principal Cause of their Creation. Here then, the distinction between the Prepositions $\delta\iota\alpha$ and $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is frivolous and of no use at all, for $\delta\iota\alpha$ here doth not signify the efficiency of an instrumental, but of the principal Cause, for the World was made *for him by whom it was made*, but it was not made *for the instrumental*, but *for the principal Cause*. And so $\delta\iota\alpha$ is used elsewhere, to denote the efficiency of the principal Cause; as for Instance, *Rom. 11. 36.* there we have both the same Prepositions $\delta\iota\alpha$ with the Genitive, and $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, the one denoting the principal Efficient, the other the final Cause. *Through* or *by* whom, and *to* or *for* whom are all Things; to whom be Glory for evermore. Amen. And all this is strongly confirmed by what is written of our Blessed Saviour, the Eternal Son of God, in the first and last Chapters of the *Revelation*. In *Revel. 1. 8.* He is set forth under the glorious Titles of [*Alpha* and *Omega*, the beginning and the end; the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.] And what

what is objected from the 4th and 5th Verses, that *there*, he who is, and who was, and who is to come, is expressly distinguished from Jesus Christ, makes nothing against the 8th Verse, its being written of Jesus Christ; for we grant and firmly believe, that Jesus Christ is distinct from the Father, both as he is the Eternal Son, and as he is Mediator between God and Men, and yet notwithstanding that distinction, he is one God, and hath the same Deity with the Father. The Father and he are one *Jehovah*, which is, and was, and is to come. The Son is expressly called the *mighty God*, and *Jehovah* our Righteousness, as was proved before, from *Isa. 9. 6.* and *Jerem. 23. 5, 6.* and so all that is said in the 8th Verse of *Rev. 1.* doth well agree to our Saviour, as he is the one *Jehovah* with the Father; for those Words, *who is, who was, and who is to come*, contain in them nothing but the signification and explication of the Name *Jehovah*.

And now that what is said in the 8th Verse is affirmed of Jesus Christ the Son of God, is evident from the 11th Verse, where we find, that the great Voice, as of a Trumpet, which *St. John*, when he was in the Spirit, heard behind him, said unto him, [*I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last;*] and upon this, *St. John* turning himself to see the Voice, that is, to see him who uttered the Voice that spake to him, he saw seven golden Candlesticks; and in the midst of them one like unto the Son of Man, &c. and as we read *v. 17, 18.* *John falling down at his Feet as dead, he laid his right Hand upon him, saying unto him, [Fear not, I am the first and the last; I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore. Amen.]* By all which it is evident, that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is set forth to us by these glorious Titles of *Alpha* and *Omega*, *beginning and end, first and last*, &c. And so likewise he describes himself, in *Rev. 22. 13.* *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last:* That the Person assuming to himself these Titles and Attributes is the Son of God, appears plainly from the 16th Verse, where it is written [*I Jesus have sent mine Angel to testify unto you these Things in the Churches. I am the Root and Off-spring of David, and the bright and Morning Star.*] From these Passages of holy Scripture, I infer by good and necessary Consequence, that Jesus Christ the Eternal Son, is the True God, the great *Jehovah*, and hath the same Deity with the Eternal Father; they are *both* the one living and true God, tho' they are two Persons distinct from one another: Because to be the *first and last*, are Titles appropriated to the only true God, the great *Jehovah* in the old Testament, as it is written *Isa. 41. 4.* *I am the Lord (Jehovah) the first and with the last, I am He.* And *Isa. 44. 6.* *Thus saith the Lord (it is Jehovah) the King of Israel,*
and

and his Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts, I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God. Again, *Isa.* 48. 12. *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel, my called, I am he, I am the first, I also am the last.* Ye see that to be *Jehovah, the first and the last*, is proper and peculiar to the true and living God, the God of *Israel*; but Jesus Christ the Eternal Son, is *Jehovah, the first and the last*; therefore he is the true and living God, the God of *Israel*, and hath the same Deity with his Eternal Father. I infer also from his being the great *Jehovah, the first and the last*, that he is not the instrumental Cause, but the principal efficient Cause, and the ultimate end of the whole created World. The Father and he are two Persons, but they are one Creator, because they both concurred by one and the same Infinite creative Power to create the World; and yet as Father and Son differ in the manner of their Subsistence in the same Deity, so there is a difference in the manner of their operating *ad extra*. The Father's manner of Subsistence is of himself and from none other, and so his manner of Operation *ad extra* is from himself alone: But now as the Son's manner of Subsistence in the same Deity is from the Father, so is his manner of Operation *ad extra*, from the Father, he works from the Father, and the Father works by him, not as by an instrumental Cause, but as principal Cause with himself, because *opera eorum ad extra sunt indivisa*, their external Works proceed indivisibly from the same Deity and Divine Power, but with a difference as to manner of Proceeding, according to the difference of their Persons: Yet this difference in the manner of Operations, is not so great as to make the one Person the meer Instrument of the other in Operations *ad extra*, as in the World's Creation; for Father, Son, and Spirit, by the immense unlimited Power of the Deity in them all, effected the World's Creation, each Person exerting the same infinite Power in a way suitable to the manner of their personal Subsistence in the same common Deity. Accordingly it is writren, *Isa.* 44. 24. *I am the Lord that maketh all Things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, that spreadeth Abroad the Earth by my self.* Here we see the great *Jehovah* created all Things alone and by himself, without any instrumental Cause distinct from himself, and yet in this one Lord Creator, there was, and is a plurality of Persons creating, as it is written, *Eccles.* 12. 1. Remember בוראֵי Bore'ka, thy Creator, in the plural Number; and again, *Psal.* 149. 2. *Let Israel rejoyce (בְּעַשְׂוֹ Behosaiu) in him that made him.* The Hebrew Particles are in the plural Number in both Places, and yet our Translators did wisely in rendring them in the singular Number, *Creator*, and not *Creators*, because tho' there be more Persons than one that create, yet those Persons are but one Creator,

tor, because they are *one God*, and have but *one Deity*, and absolute Divine Power by which they do create. And thus I have sufficiently proved the infallible Truth of what I observed and affirmed from the 3d Verse of the first Chapter of St. John's Gospel, That the *Eternal substantial Word, is the Eternal God*. That he is not another distinct God, either co-ordinate with, or subordinate to God the Father, but that he is the same God, and hath the self same Deity with the Father; and that the difference of the one from the other, doth not lye in the Deity it self, but in the *different manner* of the Father and Sons having *the same Deity*. I have shewed from John 10. 30. That tho' the Father and Son are certainly two distinct Persons, yet they are but *one and the same God*, that our Blessed Saviour said so *really and in effect* tho' he did not say it in so many formal express Words. That his saying it so, was not necessary nor expedient at that Time, during the low state of Humiliation which he was then in; but that the so doing of it was wisely reserved to be done by his Spirit of Truth in his Apostles, after his Resurrection and Ascension; after his glorious Exaltation, and the sending of his promised Spirit: That accordingly by his Spirit in the Apostles, he hath told his Church and People most plainly in the Holy Scriptures *who he is*; he hath told us expressly that he is a Man in whom dwells *all the fulness of the Godhead or Deity bodily*; That he is the *true God*, and Eternal Life; that he is the *great God*; that he is *God over all Blessed for evermore*; that he is the *God of Israel, the great Jehovah, who in the beginning laid the Foundation of the Earth*, and the Works of whose Hands the Heavens were; that he created the whole World, the material and intellectual World, and all Things pertaining thereunto, whether they be visible or invisible; and that he did not create the World merely as a ministerial instrumental Cause, but as the *principal efficient and final Cause* of all. For all Things were made *by him and for him*, and he was before all Things, and by him all Things consist: He is the great Lord (*Jehovah*) which is, and was, and is to come, the Almighty, the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end: He is the first and the last, the *first principal Cause*, and last end of all Things; and therefore it cannot be true that he was only the ministerial instrumental Cause of creating the World. No, no, he of whom all those great and glorious Things are truly affirmed, must needs be the principal efficient and final Cause of all Things, and so the Father and he are one, *one Eternal God*; God over all Blessed for evermore. Amen. *Q. E. D.* Now if my designed brevity would permit me, I should proceed to answer the Objections which are brought against the Truth that I believe, and have clearly proved.

Objection 1. The Son of God, Jesus Christ, cannot (say they) be God, he could not have the same Deity with the Father, because as we read in St. *Matt.* 19. 17. Christ himself chid the Man that called him *good Master*, and said unto him, why callest thou me good? There is none good but *one*, that is God. To this Objection I find some answer, by mending our Translation, thus, there is none good, but one *Person*, that is God. But this emendation of our Translation is not to be admitted.

(1.) Because in the *Greek* Text there is no such Word as signifies (*Person*.) The Words in the Original are exactly as our Translation renders them. There is none good but one (*that is*) God.

(2.) Because neither *ὁ ἄριστος*, nor *καλὸς* (the Words used in the *Greek* Testament to signify *Person*) can agree in Construction either with the Word *one*, or *good*; for *ὁ ἄριστος* is of the Feminine Gender, and *καλὸς* of the Neuter; whereas (*εἷς*) (*one*;) and *ἀγαθός* (*good*) in the *Greek*, are both of the Masculine Gender, and so is also *οὐδείς* (*none*.) This emendation therefore of our Translation, may indeed beguile an *English* Reader who understands not the Original, but he that looks into, and understands the *Greek*, will presently see the weakness of it; besides, that it seems to be all over *Socinian*, for they would have it so rendered and read, because it seems to countenance their Opinion against the Trinity, that in God there are not *Three* Persons, but that God is *one Person only*, to wit, the Father*. And I well remember that above more than half a score of Years ago, I met with the same Objection against our Translation from an *Unitarian*, and the same way of mending it. But,

(2.) Suppose this emendation of the Translation should be admitted, yet would it not clear up the difficulty: Because, it may be said, That the Man did only call Christ good Master; and was not this true? Yes, certainly he was a good Master, for he was at least a good Man, and a Teacher of good Doctrine, and the *Jew* thought so, and therefore called him good Master; where then was his fault? Why was he chid? And how could our Blessed Lord truly say, there is none good but the one God? Since he himself was good, even as Man, and as a Teacher of the People. For answer therefore to this objected difficulty, we may well suppose what is not improbable.

(1.) That the Man was of the Sect of the *Pharisees*, and it is well known that the *Pharisees* were self Justiciaries, great magnifiers of the Power of Man's Free Will; and those of that Sect

* See Dr. Clarke of the Trinity, pag. 429. where he says expressly, [There are not Three, but one Eternal uncreated Person.]

are so to this Day; they are downright *Pelagians*, and think that a Man, if he will, may attain to be really and truly good without help from any but himself. Now tho' this Man seems not to have had such Thoughts of himself;

Yet, (2.) It is like he had such Thoughts of Christ; it is possible he might have some suspicion that he might be the Messiah who was generally expected about that Time. But whatever be of that, yet it is certain he thought him to be but a meer Man, tho' a very good Man; and it may be he thought, that if any of the Pharasaical Saints were good of themselves, by the good improvement of their natural Powers and Faculties, without the help of any other; that *Jesus of Nazareth* was much more likely to be good of himself; good without help from any other, God or Man, by his *δύσεως*, by the Power of his Free Will. And then,

(3.) Coming to our Saviour with such Thoughts of him in his Mind, that he was so very good a Man, so eminently good and holy without dependance upon, or help from any other, he first fell down to worship him (as *Mark* hath it, *chap. 10. 17.*) not with a meer civil Worship, but with a kind of holy Religious Worship, such as *Cornelius* would have given unto *Peter*, *Acts 10. 25, 26.* And then he said, *good Master what shall I do, &c.*

(4.) Our most Blessed Lord knowing the Thoughts of his Heart, knowing that he believed him to be but a Man, and yet to be good independently, without being beholding to any for his goodness, he might well answer him, (as he often did to others) according to the Thoughts which he saw in his Heart, *why callest thou me good? There is none good but one (that is) God.* As if our Lord had said, I know what is in thy Heart, I know thou thinkest me to be a meer Man, and yet thou thinkest also that I am a very good Man, and that I owe my goodness to none but my self; now why callest thou me good in that Sense, for there is none good in that Sense, but one, that is God? And thou dost not believe me to be God, why then callest thou me good in that Sense, which can belong to none but to the one true God, the God of *Israel*? Here is a clear account given of our Lord's chiding the Man, and blaming him for calling him good, upon supposition that he had in his Mind such Thoughts of our Lord Christ. But possibly it will be said that there was never any Man in his Wits so absurd, as to entertain such Thoughts of a meer Man, as to believe that he could be good, morally good of himself, without being beholding to any other, God or Man, for his goodness. Whereunto I answer, that it is indeed very absurd, and it had been well for Men, if never any of them had been so absurd, and blasphemously proud and unreasonable. But

I shall plainly prove that there have been such absurd Men in the World. And I begin with that great Man, *Cicero*, the Roman Orator, in his Third Book, *De natura Deorum*, concerning the Nature of the Gods. Towards the end of the Book, he thus writes in the Person of *Cotta*, *Virtutem nemo unquam acceptam Deo retulit, nimirum rectè: propter virtutem enim jure laudamur, & in virtute rectè gloriamur. Quod non contingeret, si id donum a Deo, non a nobis haberemus*; that is, no Man ever acknowledged that he had his Vertue from God, and they did rightly in that; for we are justly praised for Vertue, and we rightly glory in our Vertue: Which would not be, if we had it as a gift from God, and not from our selves. And a little after, *Num quis quòd bonus vir esset, gratias Diis egit unquam?* Did ever any give Thanks to God, for making him a good Man? — And a little after, *judicium hoc omnium mortalium est, fortunam a Deo petendum, a seipso sumendam esse sapientiam*. This is the Judgment, or Opinion of all the Men in the World, that we ought to pray unto God for Wealth or Honour, but that our Wisdom is from our selves. To the same purpose *Seneca* frequently. I will quote only one Passage out of his 31st Epistle. *Unum bonum est quod beata vita causa & firmamentum est, sibi fidere*, i. e. The one good Thing which is the Cause and firm Foundation of a happy Life, is to trust in ones self. And a little after, *quid votis opus est? Fac te ipse felicem*, what needest thou to pray? Make thy self Happy. — So *Arianus*, lib. 1. c. 29. Speaking as from the Mouth of his Master, the famous *Epictetus*, [*Deus hanc sancivit legem & dixit: Si bonum aliquod vis, accipe tibi a teipso.*] God hath established this Law, and said, if thou wouldst have any good, (to wit, moral Good or Vertue,) receive it from thy self. The same Author, lib. 4. cap. 1. *Libertas sui ipsius Domina est, nec ab ullo dependet nisi a seipsa*: That is, Free Will is absolutely master of it self, nor doth it depend upon any, but upon it self. And *Epictetus* himself saith, that it is, *ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν*, the very State and Character, or express Image of a Philosopher, *omnem utilitatem & damnum a semetipso expectare*, to expect all good or evil from himself. *Epict. Enchiridion*, cap. 71. Edit. Lond. 1659. These Things considered, and this being the Opinion of several Philosophers, and many at least of the Pharisees being of the same Opinion with that Sect of Philosophers, as to the power of Man's Free Will, in respect of moral Good and virtuous Actions, according to the account which *Basnage* gives of them; and since *Cicero* saith this is *judicium omnium mortalium*, the Judgment of all Men, to wit, in their natural State, and therefore the *Pelagian* Heresie is called *Hæresis nature*, the natural Heresie; I appeal to the Judgment of reasonable Men, whether

it be not probable that he who called our Saviour-good Master, was of this same Opinion with respect to our Saviour, and whether our Blessed Lord knowing this to be in his Heart, had not good reason to give him a reprimand, and to tell him that none was good in that Sense, but one, even God. And this may suffice for answer to that first Objection.

A Second *Objection*, is, That the Father is said to be *fons Deitatis*, the Fountain of the Deity, therefore the Son cannot be the same God, nor can he have the same Deity with the Father, but there must be *two Deities*, one Deity of the Father, and another Deity of the Son; and the Deity of the Son is a secondary, derived and dependent Deity, a Deity distinct from and dependent on the Father's Deity. I answer, by denying the consequence which is grounded upon an equivocal Form of Speech, which hath two significations, one Orthodox and True, the other Heretical and False. The True and Orthodox Sense is this, That the Deity was from Eternity in the Father, as the first Person in order and manner of Subsistence in the Deity, and the Father having the Deity from no other, from all Eternity begot the Son in Union and Communion of the self same Deity; so that there are not two distinct Deities, but one Deity in both Father and Son, as I have already proved from God's own written Word. And the Father is said (not indeed by God, but) by fallible Men, to be the Fountain of the Deity, because the very same Deity which is common to Father and Son, is from the Father in the Son, by an incomprehensible Communication; I say incomprehensible as to the manner of it, which is not revealed, but the Thing it self is revealed, and we know and believe it to be true; to wit, that the self same Deity is from the Father, and in the Father to the Son, and in the Son by an eternal Generation: So that the same individual Deity is in them both, and they are absolutely inseparable from one another, though they are really distinct from one another by their personal Characters and Properties, as Father and Son. In this Sense, I grant that the Father may be said to be *fons Deitatis*, the Fountain of the Deity, tho' it is no scriptural, but a human form of Speech; and I do not much approve it, but had rather say that the Father is *fons Trinitatis*, the Fountain of the Trinity. Yet because it is capable of this Orthodox True Sense, I admit it in this Sense; for in this Sense it hath been used by many Orthodox Writers both ancient and modern, and so it was used by Calvin, witness what he writes in his Institutions, lib. 1. c. 13. § 23. *Dei nomen κατ' ἑξῆς patri interdum ad scribitur, quia fons est ac principium Deitatis: Idque ut notetur simplex essentia unitas.* The Name of God is sometimes by way of eminency ascribed unto the Father, because he

is the *Fountain* and Principle or Beginning of the Deity (to wit, in respect of the order and manner of its Subsistence :) And that to denote the simple Unity of the Essence or Deity. Thus he further explains his own meaning in the 26th §. *Nomen Dei restringitur ad patrem, quatenus Deitatis est principium, non essentia, ut fanatici nugantur, sed ratione Ordinis.* The Name of God is sometimes restrained to the Father, as he is the Principle of the Deity, not by his producing the Essence or Deity (*of the Son or Spirit,*) as is feigned by Fanaticks, but in respect of Order; that is, the Order of the Persons subsisting in the Union and Communion of the same Deity; of which Persons the Father is the first, and the other are from him. And by the way, hence we may see how injurious they are to *Calvin*, who exclaim against him as derogating from the Glory of the Father, because he maintained the Son to be *αὐτοθεός*; for the Word *αὐτοθεός* is ambiguous, and may be taken in Three several Senses.

Whereof the (1st.) agrees to none, no not to the Father himself.

The (2d.) agrees to the Father only.

The (3d.) is common both to Father and Son.

First, The Word *αὐτοθεός* may be imagined to denote a positive efficiency of God; and so the Father himself is not *αὐτοθεός*, he is not the efficient Cause of himself, he did not produce himself by a positive efficiency; that is impossible, and implies a manifest contradiction. And the Cardinal Jesuit *Bellarmin* doth acknowledge this to be true, and saith, that the Father is simply and absolutely unproduced; and justly blames *Lactantius* for saying, that, *Deus fuit a seipso procreatus*, God was produced by himself. *Bellarmin. lib. 2. de Christo, c. 19.*

Secondly, The Word *αὐτοθεός* is taken *sensu Negativo*, in a Negative Sense, and so it agrees to the Father only; thus the Father is *from no other Person*, because he himself is the first, and the other Persons are from him. In this Sense *Calvin* always acknowledged the Father only to be *αὐτοθεός*, and never once said that the Son was *αὐτοθεός*, but always maintained that the Son was from the Father, and (as *Bellarmin* well observes) that the Father communicated his own whole Essence or Deity to the Son. See that whole Passage of which *Bellarmin* quotes a part, thus, *si in essentia est discretio, respondeant annon cum Filio eam communicaverit? Hos vero non potuit esse ex parte: Quia dimidium fabricare Deum, nefas esset. Adde quod hoc modo facti lacerarent Dei essentiam.* Restat ut tota & in solidum patris & Filii sit communis. *Calvin, Instit. lib. 1. cap. 13. § 23.* The meaning of these Words of *Calvin*, is, that God the Father and Son are not distinguished from one another by the Deity, for that is common to them both, and is the same in them both; but with this difference, that

that the Father communicates the Deity, his own self same Deity, whole and entire to the Son : And in this Sense the Father only is God of himself, i. e. he is from no other Person. But,

Thirdly, The Word *αὐτοθεός* is taken in *Sensu positivo formali*, in a positive formal Sense borrowed from a formal Cause ; which I explain and make intelligible thus. The essential Form of a Thing is said to give the Thing its Being and Nature, it constitutes it in its specifical Being, and distinguishes it from all other Things of a different Nature : It doth not indeed do it by any proper Efficiency, and so it is not so properly a Cause, as the efficient Cause is ; yet it furnisheth us with a good Reason whereby we know that the Thing is of such a Kind and Nature, because it hath such an essential Form whereby it is what it is, and is distinguished from all other Things, which have not such an essential Form, and are not of such a Nature as it is. Now to apply this to the matter in hand. The internal essential Form of God, formally considered as God, can be nothing but the Deity it self, whereby he is God, and distinguished from every Thing that is not at all God. It is the substantial Essence of God as such, and the Foundation as it were of all the absolute Perfections of God, and as it were the Subject, to which are ascribed by us all the absolute Divine Attributes : And it is expressed in holy Scripture by God's proper Name, *Jehovah*, which signifies, that he is, that he so is, as that he ever was, and ever will be ; From Everlasting to Everlasting, (Psal. 90. 2, and Rev. 1. 4, 8.) It is expressed also by his Name *אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה* *Ehjah*, I am ; and *אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה* *Ehjah asher Ehjah*, I am that I am, as our Translators render the Words. We justly say of God, *he is*, *he is* as none other is or can be : And God saith of himself, *I am*, or *I will be*, that is, *I am so*, as that *I ever was*, and *ever will be* ; yea, God saith of himself, *I am what I am*, or rather, as I humbly conceive, the Words *Ehjah asher Ehjah*, would be better and more significantly Translated, *I am because I am*, or *I will be because I will be*, for the Hebrew Word *אֲשֶׁר* *Asher*, not only signifies, *qui, quæ, quod*, *which or what*, but it likewise signifies *quia, because* ; as in 1 Sam. 15. 15. and that Sense doth admirably well agree to this Name of God, and it gives us a most evident Reason of the Being and Existence of our incomparable God ; for he therefore is, *because he is of such a Nature, that he cannot but be*. God saith of himself, and God only can truly and properly say of himself, *I am*, *because I am* ; and *I will be*, *because I will be* ; for I have my Being from no other : I exist altogether independently, and therefore I exist necessarily from Everlasting to Everlasting. But all other Beings have their Being from me, and exist dependently upon me : therefore they exist, *because I exist*, and *because it is my Free Will that they should exist*, and they can exist no longer than I please.

But

But I my self do exist, because I do exist; and there can no other necessary Reason be given why I exist, but because I am a Being so absolutely necessary, and infinitely Perfect, that it is absolutely impossible for me not to exist. Now in this formal Sense it is, that the Eternal Son is *absolutes*, for being one God with the Father, and having the same Eternal Deity which the Father hath, as hath been proved; as the Father's Deity is *unoriginate* and *independent*, so also must the Son's Eternal Deity be *unoriginated* and *independent*, i. e. from no other Deity, because the Deity is the same in them both, tho' not in the same manner. That different manner doth not hinder the Deity, its being the same in both Father and Son; and if it be the same in both, it's independent in both: For Independence is of the very formal Nature and Essence of the Deity, in which soever of the Persons it really and truly is. It was in this Sense only that Calvin held the Son to be *absolutes*, God of himself, as manifestly appears from what I have quoted out of him already, and from what he writes in the same 23d § before mentioned, where from the Son's being *Jehovah*, he says [*sequitur Deitatis respectu ex seipso esse. Nam si est Jehovah, negari non potest quin idem sit ille Deus qui per Jesaiam alibi clamat. Ego, ego sum, & præter me non est Deus, Isa. 44. 6.*] It follows (saith he) that in respect of the Deity, he is of himself, for if he is *Jehovah*, it cannot be denyed, but that he is that same God which cries by *Isaiah*, *I even I am the first and the last, and besides me there is no God.* Calvin proves the same Truth also, from *Jer. 10. 11.* and from other Places of *Isaiah*, where the Deity is proved by the Creation of the World; and says, *quomodo Creator qui omnibus esse dat, non erit ex seipso, sed essentiam aliunde mutuabitur*, i. e. The Creator who gives Being to all other Things, how shall he not be of himself, but must borrow his Essence from another, that is, borrow his Deity from another Deity distinct from his Deity. That is certainly his meaning, as appears from the context and tenour of his Discourse, and afterwards plainly he declares in § 25. in what Sense he believed the Son to be *absolutes*. *Deitatem ergo absolute, ex seipsa esse dicimus. Unde & Filium quatenus Deus est, fatemur ex seipso esse, sublato Personæ respectu: Quatenus verò Filius est, dicimus esse ex patre, &c.* We therefore say that the Deity absolutely considered, is of it self; whence we confess, that the Son, as he is God, is of himself, abstracting from the consideration and respect of his Person: But as he is the Son, we say that he is of the Father, &c. All this, and more that might be said, shews that Calvin held our blessed Lord to be *absolutes*, God of himself in no other Sense than what is true and sound, and therefore here the very Jesuit *Bellarmin* was so ingenuous and just, as to vindicate Calvin from the false Charge of the pretended *Atheist* Heresie; and affirms that the Son of God

is *ὁ Θεός* in a true and sound Sense, that it may signifie him who is the very God, who is most truly God. And he quotes *Epiphanius*, *Hæc.* 69. calling the Son *ὁ Θεός*. Bishop *Pearson* also on the Creed, 3th Edit. 1683. pag. 39. owns that there is a Catholick Sense in which the Son of God is *ὁ Θεός*, and this also is acknowledged by Bishop *Bull*. And I have sufficiently shewed what that Sense is. And now from this Digression concerning *ὁ Θεός*, I return to the Objection taken from the Fathers, being called *πρῶτον θεῶντος*, *sons Deitatis*, the Fountain of the Deity. I said that the said Form of Speech hath two Senses, the first Orthodox and True, the second Heterodox and False. I have said enough of the true and sound Sense which we admit, &c.

(2d.) I pass now to the Second, to wit, that mentioned in the Objection, which we cannot in Conscience admit, because it is false in a very weighty and important Point of Doctrine. Now the false Sense of the Father's being said to be *sons Deitatis*, is this, That there are more Deities than one; that there is one Deity of the Father, and another Deity of the Son, and that the one Deity is the Fountain of the other Deity; and that the Second Deity depends upon the first. This is the false and heretical Sense of *sons Deitatis*, the Fountain of the Deity. And some have thought *Origen*, and some other of the ancient Doctors might hold this Sense of the Phrase, but none of the Orthodox ever used it in that Sense, which is absolutely False, and would bring a sort of Heathenish Polytheism, and plurality of Gods into the Christian Church. Nor doth the *Form of Words* bear such a Sense; for, I pray observe, it is not said that the Deity of the Father is the Fountain of the Deity of the Son, for then indeed there would be two Deities, because it is impossible that the same Deity could be the Fountain of it self; that implies a manifest contradiction. But the Form of Words which we are now considering, is this, that the Father is the Fountain of the Deity. Now the Word *Father* here signifies more than his meer Deity absolutely considered; for it signifies also his peculiar manner of Subsistence in the Deity, his subsisting from no other, but as absolutely the first Person; and by this peculiar way of subsisting in the Deity, he is inadequately distinguished from the Deity in which he subsists; and as so subsisting he begets his Son after an incomprehensible manner, giving another manner of Subsistence to his own Deity in the Person of his Son. So then, it is not the meer Deity that begets the Deity, but it is the Person of the Father that begets the Person of the Son; and it is the Person of the Father that is said to be the Fountain of the Deity, not of a distinct Deity, but of the same Deity which is from the Father to the Son; and is the same both in Father and Son, but subsisting after

after a different manner in each of them: And there being but one and the same Deity in Father and Son, it is simply impossible that the Son's Deity should be a dependent Deity, and the Father's Deity Independent, since they are both one, and independency is essential to the Deity: But say some, Independency cannot be communicated. I answer, Independency cannot be communicated to a Creature *extra Deum*, is most true, for it implies a Contradiction, that a Creature should be Independent: But to say, that it cannot be communicated with the Eternal Deity to the uncreated Son of God, is *Petitio Principii*, a poor begging of the Question. For since the same Deity is in the Father and the Son, as I have proved, and since the Son is and must be from the Father, it follows by necessary Consequence, that the Father by communicating the same Deity, he hath communicated the same Independency which is essential to the Deity. And hence it is, that in the external Works of the Creation, as the Son doth nothing without the Father, so the Father doth nothing without the Son *as he is one God* with the Father; for they operate in such Matters by one, and the same Infinite Divine Power; and tho' some Works are said to be appropriated to one Person, and some to another; yet the same Deity in them both, exerts it self in the same external Works, notwithstanding that Appropriation of them to this or that distinct Person. This I say of the Father and Son, as they are *one God*. But now if we consider our Lord as the Son of Man, personally united to the Eternal Word, and invested with the mediatorial Office; so I freely grant, and must grant his Dependence on and Subjection to the Father, and that he acts by Commission, and will do so till he hath finished that great and glorious Work which he is called unto, and then he will deliver up the Mediatorial Office and Kingdom to the Father, and God shall be all in all.

A Third Objection is, That the Son was begotten by the Will of the Father, and therefore he hath a precarious Being, which depended on the Will of the Father, and so could never be God, nor have the same Deity with the Father.

I answer, By denying the Consequence, and let any Man put the Argument into Form, it will presently appear to be a Sophism, consisting of Four Terms. Thus, what God the Father doth by his Will, it might not have been, and so it exists precariously and dependently, but God the Father begot his Son by his Will. Therefore, &c. This is a Sophism of four Terms, for the middle Term hath two different Significations, which make two Terms, and these with the two Extremes make four Terms; and so the Argument is of no value. And that this
may

may appear clearly, I distinguish between Things which God doth by his Will; some things he doth by his Will with an eternal necessity of Nature, so he loved himself with his Understanding and by his Will, and yet notwithstanding that, he loved himself by an eternal necessity of Nature, and could not possibly do otherwise than love himself.

But now, *Secondly*, There are other Things which he doth by his Will, with an absolute freedom of Choice, such was the Creation of this World, and all Creatures in it, and hence it is, that they all exist contingently, and precariously; they all necessarily depend on the Will of God. Now to apply this Distinction, will Men say that the Son of God was begotten by the Father's Will of free Choice, as the World was freely created by the Will of God! That would be *monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ad emptum!* A most horrid, ugly, unreasonable Monster of Opinion, which will never be entertained in the Head or Heart of a Sober, Serious, Orthodox Christian. For upon that Supposition, the Son would be a contingent Being, which might never have been, and so the Father might never have been Father, for the Relation is mutual; and the one cannot be without the other. This Member of the Distinction, I therefore reject with Abhorrence as false and blasphemous, and I embrace the other Member of the Distinction; and affirm, that the Eternal Father begot his Eternal Son by an eternal natural Necessity, and yet he did it with his Understanding and Will, for sure he did not, he could not do it ignorantly and against his Will. His Understanding could not be darkened, nor his Will forced. And the Matter being thus, he existed and doth exist most necessarily and not precariously, at the free indifferent Will of another. As to that of dependency of the Sons Deity, I have refuted it before. I shall only add, that as to the Persons of Father and Son *formally* considered *as such*, there was no real proper dependence of the Son on the Father; but both of them from Eternity did necessarily and unchangeably Coexist with a natural Emanation of the Son from the Father, after an incomprehensible Manner (*Psalms 145. 3.*) and a mutual Relation of both to one another.

A Fourth Objection is taken from the *Nicene Creed*, where it is said that the Eternal and only begotten Son, is God of God, whence some would infer, that there are two Gods, a derived God, and an underived God, a dependent God, and an independent God, a great and a little God. This is a frivolous Objection, and I answer it by denying the Consequence again, and I know it can never be proved. The Form of Speech, *God of God*, signifies no more, but that the Son who is God, is of the

the Father who is God; but the meaning is not, that they are two distinct Gods by two distinct Deities; for I have proved already by the Scriptures of Truth, that there is but one Deity in Father and Son, and they are both one God by one and the same Deity. And the reason for using that form of Words, is, because the Father who is God, did from Eternity beget the Son in the Union and Communion of the same Deity after an incomprehensible Manner; and so the Son who is God is of the Father who is God, yet are they not two Gods, but *one God*, and two Persons; distinguished indeed by their Personal Properties, and Characters, but identified in the Communion of the same Deity.

Fifth Objection, But now comes another Objection of great weight, as some imagine, for they think that this Plurality of Persons in God, will

(1.) Subvert the omnimodous Simplicity of God.

(2.) It will infer a Composition in God. Whereunto I answer,

(1.) As to that omnimodous Simplicity, if it be not rightly understood, it may do Mischief indeed, for it may subvert the Trinity, and bring in *Sabellianism* instead of it. But the Plurality of Persons in God, will consist well enough with God's Simplicity, if it be rightly understood; and therefore for the right Understanding of this omnimodous Simplicity, we must carefully distinguish between the *Deity in the Abstract*, and *God in the Concrete*. Now it is freely granted, that there is an omnimodous Simplicity *in the Deity in the Abstract*, for it is *one*, and *but one*, and *can be no more*, it cannot be multiplied nor divided, nothing can be added to it, to increase it, nor taken from it, to diminish it. It is one Infinite Perfection *formally*, or *eminently*, and *virtually* containing all possible Perfection. Such indeed is the narrowness of our Capacities, that we are forced to form inadequate Ideas of the Divine Perfections in our Minds, and so represent them to our selves one after another, as if they were many, but really they are but one in God, equivalent to many; and so they are distinguished by us in our Minds from their various Objects, and various Effects upon those Objects, and from the various Denominations which from thence are given them: Whilst in the mean Time, they are all one in the Deity it self: There is no real Plurality of *absolute* Divine Perfections, and *essential* Attributes, but they are all one. But, *2dly*. If we consider God in the *Concrete*, there, we shall find, that besides the before-mentioned absolute Simplicity, there is a Plurality of Personal Properties and Characters really differing from one another, and with the one simple or single Deity, they are

are a Plurality of Persons. Now here cannot be an omnimodous Simplicity, for *esse omnimodo simplex & esse aliquo modo non simplex, sed multiplex, vel. binum aut trinum sunt contradictoria*; for these are Contradictories for one and the same Thing, in the same Respect to be every way simple, and some way not simple, but manifold, two or threefold. I say again, these are Contradictories, and can never be true of the same Thing, in the same Respect. Therefore to reconcile the Matter, and make all agree together; we must grant and deny in different Respects. We must grant an omnimodous Simplicity in respect of the Deity in the Abstract, and we do freely grant it; but we must deny, and do deny an omnimodous Simplicity exclusive of a Plurality in the Concrete, God. For there is in God a real Plurality of Persons. Now this leads us on to answer the Objection, as to the first Part of it, which was, that a Plurality of Persons in God, doth subvert the omnimodous Simplicity of God. I answer, by denying that, a Plurality of Persons in God, doth not subvert that omnimodous Simplicity which truly belongs to God according to the Scriptures, for it is well consistent with the omnimodous Simplicity of the Deity in the abstract. But as for God considered in the Concrete, the Holy Scripture ascribes to him a Plurality of Persons, and consequently in that Respect removes from him an omnimodous Simplicity.

But now comes the Second Part of the Objection, and says, that a Plurality of Persons in God, will infer a Composition in God. To which I answer, that that is not true, no such Thing doth follow by good Consequence. It follows indeed, that in God considered in the Concrete, there is and must be a Distinction, and that a real Distinction; I mean a Distinction that is not a meer *ens rationis*, a Creature of Man's Brain, that owes its Existence only to the Mind of Man; and therefore Men should have a Care that they do not think nor say, that it is only *distinctio rationis*, a Distinction, which is the meer Effect of their own Reason, for so the Trinity would be of the same Nature; to wit, a meer imaginary Thing, a Fiction of Man's Brain, which is false and blasphemous, and is indeed *Judaism*, *Sabellianism* and *Photinianism*. But we believe and know, that it is a real Distinction. Divines differ about the Name of it, some call it a real modal Distinction, some call it *distinctio formalis ex natura rei*, a formal Distinction from the Nature of the Thing, others again call it a real virtual Distinction. For my own Part, I care not much by what Name Men please to call it, provided always that they grant unto me, that it is a real Distinction; *ante omnem operationem intellectus creati*, antecedent to all the Operations of any created Understanding of Angels or Men. And I do

not *merely beg* that this may be granted to me, but I *demand it in Justice and Reason*; because I have already clearly proved, That the Eternal Father and Coeternal Son have one and the same Deity, whereby they are one God; and that yet they are *two Persons*, as Father and Son, really distinguished from one another, because they are *relatively opposed to one another*; and it is evidently impossible, that *one and the same Person* can be his *own Father and his own Son*. It's plain then, they are two Persons really distinct from one another; I say, *really, inadequately*, according to that of the Son himself, *John 10. 30. I and my Father are one*, of which enough before. There is therefore a real Distinction in God, there is an Union and Communion of really distinct Persons, in the same Deity; but it doth not follow from thence, that there is a *real Composition* in God. I freely grant, that in every real proper Composition, there is *distinctorum unio*, there is an Union of Things distinct. But I utterly deny, that it is true *vice versa*, that it is reciprocally true, that where-ever there is *distinctorum unio*, *ex. gr. Patris & filii*, there is a real Composition, that where ever there is an Union of distinct Persons, as of Father and Son, there is a real proper Composition. That is so far from being true, that it is impossible it should be true. There is an Union of distinct Persons, but there can be no real Composition in God, for these Reasons.

1. *Reason*, Where-ever there is a real proper Composition, there must be a Compositor or Compounder distinct from and antecedent to the Compound, to be the Cause of the Composition; but there never was, nor ever could be any Thing *before* God, and distinct from God, to be the Cause of compounding him. For God is the *first* and the *last*, from Everlasting to Everlasting, and this is true both of Father and Son, as was proved before. And therefore there cannot be a real Composition in God, the Thing is impossible.

2. *Reason*, But further, I shew there cannot be a real Composition in God, nor doth any such Thing follow from a Plurality of Persons in God: Thus where-ever there is a real Composition; there must be Parts in the Compound, both really distinct, and also really separable from one another, at least by an infinite Power. But there are no such Parts in God, nothing in God is really separable from God. For God is absolutely unchangeable; he can Change all Things without himself, and distinct from himself, but he cannot Change himself, he is altogether unchangeable, from Everlasting to Everlasting; he remains always the same in himself (*Mal. 3. 6. Heb. 1. 10, 11, 12. Jam. 1. 17.*) The distinct Persons then, or Personalities that are in God, can never make any real Composition in him, because they

they are not Parts of him, they are absolutely inseparable from him, they cannot be separated from him by any Power, no, not by his own Infinite Power; for it could not be done without a Change in God; but a Change in God is impossible: For he is absolutely unchangeable, Immutability is essential to God. Thus I have plainly proved, that a Plurality of Persons or Personal Properties in God, doth neither subvert that Simplicity that belongs to God, nor infer a real Composition in God. There is no Reason to be afraid of such a Consequence; for indeed the Thing is impossible. This Push therefore at the first Doctrinal Article of the Established Church which we have subscribed, doth no Execution; and we see no reason to withdraw our Assent from it.

I acknowledge, there are other Objections brought against the Truth, which I have been proving from Scripture, and defending by Scripture and Reason; and though I could as easily answer the other Objections, as I have answered the five Objections before mentioned, yet I must stop here, because I have already gone beyond my first designed Brevity. Therefore for Answer to other Objections, I must refer to other excellent Writers, who have vindicated this most important Truth with great Judgment and Solidity, and as for *English* Readers, I would in a special Manner recommend to them, the Reverend, Learned, and Judicious Mr. *Boyse* his Vindication of the true Deity of our Blessed Saviour. The Reverend and Learned Gentlemen who differ in Judgment from us, are said to be serious and sober Men, and I honour and truly love them as such. I am against persecuting them in this World for their Opinions, or condemning their Persons with respect to the Life to come. Though they have fallen from the Truth in a very important Point of Doctrine, yet through Grace they may rise again, and I heartily beseech God for Christ the Mediator's sake, that they may do so. In the mean Time, let us leave them to God, and hope the best of them, that it is not through Wickedness, but involuntary Weakness, that they are fallen into such Opinions. I take it to be safest for us to judge so of them, and to hope the best. And therefore, I do not approve of the damnatory Clauses of the Creed, commonly (tho' without Reason) called the *Athanasian Creed*. And this I fairly and honestly declared, when I subscribed the Articles. It is enough for us to condemn Opinions, and in that also we ought to be cautious, and not to do it rashly, before we have taken Time thoroughly to consider and examine the Matter; but as for the Persons themselves, to pass the Sentence of Condemnation upon them as to their Eternal State, it is in my Judgment great Presumption; and a very sinful Usurpation

surpation of that Power, which belongs to none but to Christ the proper Judge, to whom alone, the Father hath committed it. I think therefore, that *Salvian* was a much better and wiser Man, than he who put the damnatory Clauses into the before mentioned Creed. For thus he writes of the

Lib. 5. de Arians of his Time, Nos eos injuriam Divinae Generationis. Dei rationi facere certi sumus, quod minorem Patre Filium edit. Oxon. dicant: Illi nos injuriosos Patri existimant, quia aequales esse credimus. — Errant igitur, sed bono animo errant, non odio, sed affectu Dei, honorare se Dominum atque amare credentes — qualiter pro hoc ipso falsa Opinionis errore in die judicii puniendi sint, nullus potest scire, nisi iudex. That

is, we are sure, that they are injurious to the Divine Generation, because they (the *Arians*) say the Son is lesser than the Father; but they think we are injurious to the Father, because we believe them to be equal. — They err then, but they err with a good Mind or Intention, not of hatred, but of love to God, believing that they honour and love the Lord — after what manner they are to be punished in the Day of Judgment, for this Error of a false Opinion, none can know but the Judge. Thus *Salvian* concerning the *Arians* of that Age, and it was towards the end of the Fifth Century. I will quote a Passage out of another Author of the same Century, but somewhat earlier, about the Time of the Council of *Chalcedon*; and I do it for the sake of the *Roman Catholicks* and others, that they may thereby see, into what Principles the Christians of that Age used to resolve their Faith, and by what Means they obtained a saving Faith. And the Testimony, I suppose, will be the more acceptable to some for the Authors sake who was a Bishop of *Rome*, and a right *Diotrephes*, who loved to have the Preheminence. It is *Leo* the I. in his 5th Sermon on the Nativity of our Lord. Thus then he writes, *Quod Filius Dei, qui cum Patre & Spiritu Sancto, non unius Persona, sed unius Essentiae est, dignatus est humanitatis nostra particeps fieri, & unus passibilium, unus voluit esse mortalium, tam sacratum, tamque mirabile est: Ut ratio Divini Consilii, sapientibus mundi patere non possit, nisi humana ignorantia tenebras Lux vera discusserit. Non enim in solo opere virtutum, aut in sola observantia mandatorum, sed etiam in tramite fidei, angusta & ardua via est, quae ducit ad vitam, & magni laboris est magnique discriminis, inter dubias imperitorum opiniones & veri similes falsitates per unam sanæ Doctrinæ semitam inoffensis gressibus ambulare: Et cum undique se laquei erroris opponant, omne periculum deceptionis evadere. Quis autem ad hæc idoneus, nisi qui Spiritu Dei & docetur & regitur; Dicente Apostolo (1 Cor. 2.) nos autem non Spiritum hujus mundi accepimus, sed Spiritum, qui ex Deo*

Deo est, ut sciamus, quæ a Deo donata sunt nobis: Canente etiam David (Psalm 94.) beatus Homo, quem tu erudieris Domine, & de lege tua docueris eum. Habentes itaque, dilectissimi, inter pericula erroris, præsidia veritatis, & non humana Sapientiæ verbis, sed Doctrinâ Spiritus Sancti eruditi, quod didicimus credimus: Quod credimus, prædicamus, &c. My designed Brevity doth not permit me to stay to Translate this Passage of *Leo*, I leave it therefore to be considered, and seriously Thought on by the Learned Reader. The Sense of it is plain, to wit, that there is indeed great Difficulty through the Blindness and Ignorance, mixed with the Pride and Conceitedness of natural Men, rightly to understand and believe the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation, and that there is great Danger of being deceived: And that therefore we have need of a supernatural Light from Heaven, to direct us into the way of Gospel Truth. And this we have, true Christians have the Spirit and Word of Christ to secure them from dangerous and damnable Error. This is the very way of the Reformed Churches of Christ.

(1.) We resolve our Faith into the special Grace of the Holy Spirit of Truth, as into the principal efficient Cause of it.

(2.) We resolve our Faith into the written Word, the Scriptures of Truth read and heard, as into the means of obtaining Faith from the Lord, and as into the Rule of our Faith, which gives Limits and sets Bounds to our Faith, and teaches us what we ought to believe, and what not.

(3.) We finally resolve our Faith into the Authority and Veracity of God, testifying unto us by his written Word, why and what we ought to believe, and do in order to the pleasing and glorifying of God, and the saving of our own Souls. This was likewise the way of the *Roman Church* even in the 5th Century, in the Time of the said *Leo*. Which is confirmed by another Testimony of his, from his well known 10th Epistle to *Flavian* of *Constantinople* concerning the *Eutychian* Hereticks, *Dioscorus* and his Party in and after the 2d Council of *Ephesus*. Some of his Words are as followeth, *In insipientiam cadunt, qui cum ad cognoscendam veritatem aliquo impediuntur obscuro, non ad Propheticas voces, non ad Apostolicas literas, nec ad Evangelicas Autoritates, sed ad semet ipsos recurrunt, &c.* That is, they become Fools, who (when they are hindered from knowing the Truth by some Obscurity and Difficulty which they meet with) have not recourse to the Words of the Prophets, nor to the Epistles of the Apostles, nor to the Authorities of the Gospels, but they have recourse unto themselves. Thus *Leo* charged the *Eutychians* with Folly and Error, because they would not learn the Truth from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. And

now

now is it not as clear as the Light at Noon Day, that this is the very Course which the *Roman Church* takes at this Day, they neglect and slight the Scriptures as imperfect, dark and obscure; and they have recourse unto themselves, unto their own Oral Unwritten Traditions, unto the Authority and Testimony of the present *Roman Church*, i. e. the *Pope* and his Clergy, that is, their own Testimony concerning themselves. And this Contempt of the Holy Scriptures, hath prevailed in the *Roman Church* to that Degree, that the Famous Dr. *Holden*, well known in *England* and *France*, tells us in the Preface to his Edition of the *Latin Testament* with brief Notes, Printed at *Paris*, 1660. That when he had almost finished a Book of *Christian Morality*, to teach the *Papists* their several Duties, *ipsissimis Divini eloquii Verbis*, in the very express Words of Holy Scripture, he was forced to lay it aside, because he foresaw that the People would not bear, nor hear the Naked Truth. And thereupon he says, that if he had published that Book, [*Nisi mente captus, atque omni Sensus ac rationis lumine privatus sim, necesse mihi fuisset profiteri, vel Evangelium (absit verbo invidia) fabulam esse, vel Christianos, verè Christianos paucissimos hodie apparere.*] Unless he had been Distracted, and deprived of all the Light of Sense and Reason, he must have professed that either the Gospel is a Fable, or that there are at this Day very few true Christians in the *Papish Church*. This is a Testimony of a Prophet of their own, and a great Patron of Oral Tradition. And this was the Fruit of his Oral Practical Tradition, which he lived to see and lament in his Old Age.

O that the *Roman Catholicks* would wisely consider, what will be the end of these Things. For *tho' Hand join in Hand, the Wicked shall not be unpunished, but the Seed of the Righteous shall be delivered*, Prov. 11. 21. I counsel them in Love and for their Good, to read and often think on the Warning, which St. Paul gave to the *Roman Church* of Old, Rom. 11. 20, 21, 22. *Because of unbelief the Jews were broken off (were unchurched) and thou (Church of Rome) standest by Faith; be not high minded but fear, — behold the goodness and severity of God: On them (the Jews) that fell Severity, but towards thee Goodness, if thou continue in his Goodness: Otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.* But you will say, our *Roman Church* is infallible and can never fail. I answer, That Pretence is the very Sin which St. Paul foresaw and warned against, saying, *Be not high minded, but fear.* And in Rev. 18. 7, 8. The Voice of the Angel said, that *Myistical Babylon* shall say in her Heart, *I sit a Queen — and shall see no Sorrow*, and even therefore and then shall her Plagues come in one Day, and she shall be utterly burnt with Fire, for strong is the Lord who judgeth her. Oh that People may believe and consider this, that so good may come unto them; that they may come out of, and that others may not return to *Babylon*, That they be not Partakers of her Sins, nor receive of her Plagues, Rev. 18. 4.

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

PAGE 19. Line 33. for *see*, read *set*, p. 35. l. 44. 1. *Wickum*, p. 52. l. 40. 1. *effet*.

